AN

EXAMINATION

OF THE

Enquiry into the Meaning of Demoniacs in the New Teſtament.

In a Letter to the AUTHOR.

Wherein it is ſhewn,

That the Word *Demon* does not ſignify a Departed Soul, either in the Claſſics or the Scriptures;

And conſequently,

That the whole of the *Enquiry* is without Foundation.

Οὓς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀΓγέλους Μωσῆς εἴωθεν ὀνομάζειν.

Philo Jud. de Gigant. *p.* 192. Ed. *Turneb.*

By SAMUEL PEGGE, *M. A.*
Vicar of *Godmerſham* in the County of *Kent.*

LONDON,
Printed for FLETCHER GYLES againſt *Gray's-Inn* in *Holborn.* MDCCXXXIX.
[Price 1 *s.* 6 *d.*]

To the READER.

IN defending the literal Interpretation of Demoniacs, *againſt the figurative Scheme of the Author of the* Enquiry into the Meaning of the DEMONIACS in the New Teſtament, *my Deſign is not to enter upon a Diſcuſſion of the ſeveral Caſes recorded in the Evangeliſts, being happily prevented, as to any Attempt of that kind, by the Labours of a much abler Hand, into whoſe Harveſt it would be equally preſumptuous and impertinent for me to thruſt in my Sickle. But as the learned Author may ſeem to have left ſome room for a few further Obſervations upon the general Argument, it will not be thought improper to examine the* Grounds *of the* Enquiry; *neither will Mr.* Twells *be diſpleaſed to ſee the Foundation of his own excellent Anſwers eſtabliſh'd, and his Expoſition of each particular Text conſequentially enforc'd and maintain'd. It is with this View that I have endeavour'd to canvaſs the firſt Principles of the* Enquiry, *by trying the Medium whereby the Author has thought fit to attack the Catholic Opinion, together with the Juſtneſs of his Application thereof to the Scriptures.*

The Arts of Controverſy are what I neither pretend, nor deſire to underſtand: To ſearch out, and afterwards to uphold the Truth, were the ſole Motives that induc'd me to appear in this Controverſy; and as all partial Proceedings whatſoever ought to be as far remov'd from Reſearches of this Nature, as poſſible, I have therein us'd the beſt of my Judgment, without Artifice: If the Author of the Enquiry *is conſcious to himſelf of any ſiniſter Dealings, I am ſorry for it.*

Foreſeeing from the Beginning that the Thread of this Letter was likely to run out into ſome length, I found myſelf oblig'd to take Brevity for my Rule, to keep cloſe to my Author, and to avoid, tho' ſometimes with Reluctance enough, every Occaſion of Excurſion; ſhould I be any where thought not to have ſaid enough, the Subject being copious, I deſire a due Allowance may be made for this unavoidable Reſtraint.

My Author in the Preface to the Further Enquiry, *after reporting theſe Words of St.* Auſtin: In the Scriptures we never read of GOOD DEMONS; but WHERESOEVER in them the Name of DEMONS occurs, nothing but EVIL SPIRITS is meant[a], *proceeds thus:* " *St.* " Auſtin's *Obſervation is certainly groundleſs;*

[a] Nunquam bonos dæmonas legimus: ſed ubicunque illarum litterarum [i. e. ſcripturarum] hoc nomen poſitum reperitur, ſive dæmones, ſive dæmonia, dicantur, non niſi maligni ſignificantur ſpiritus. S. *Aug.* de Civitat. Dei, lib. ix. c. 19.

" *and*

" *and yet his Miſtake is taken up and eſpouſed*
" *not only by the Author of the* Eſſay *in Anſwer*
" *to the* Enquiry, *and by Mr.* Twells; *but*
" *likewiſe by Dr.* Waterland, *Dr.* Warren,
" &c. *and then very gravely adds:* " *One*
" *cannot but reflect how eaſily and how fre-*
" *quently Men of Learning fall into this ſort*
" *of Errors, without giving themſelves the*
" *Time or Trouble to examine the Grounds on*
" *which ſuch Notions are founded.*" *He aſſerts with an Air of Confidence, and deals his Cenſures very liberally.*

Now the Obſervation has an higher Original than St. Auſtin; *you will find it both in* Euſebius [b] *and* Origen [c] *in expreſs Terms; neither do any other of the Fathers, as far as I can diſcover, ever hint that the Scriptures any where ſpeak of* good Demons. *I ſhall recite the Words of* Euſebius, *becauſe they want mending,* Τὰ μὲν γὰρ παρ' ἡμῖν θεῖα λόγια, οὐδ' ὁλως ἀγαθὸν οἶδεν ὀνομάζειν δαίμονα, πάνλας ὂ πονηρὸς εἶναι τ λέξεως ταύτης, καὶ δὴ καὶ τ προσηγορίας μελαγχόλας, ὡς, &c. *and this Reading is followed by his excellent Interpreter* Vigerus; *but it ſhould be read* τ λήξεως ταύτης, of this Allotment or Station, *by which means you avoid a wretched Tautology.*

It was not therefore upon St. Auſtin's *Authority alone that the Gentlemen above mention'd rely'd, but the Senſe of the whole pri-*

[b] *Euſeb.* Præp. Evang. lib. iv. c. 5.
[c] *Origen* contra *Celſ.* p. 234.

mitive Church; neither do I ſuppoſe they proceeded ſolely upon this, but had Recourſe at the ſame time to the divine Original, being ſo far from not examining, *that they* examin'd better *and* more thoroughly *than the* Enquirer *himſelf did: For as to the Truth of the Caſe, it will appear ſufficiently from the ſubſequent Letter, that the inſpired Authors of the New Teſtament never uſe the Word* Demon *in a* good *Senſe; on the contrary, that they always apply it to* evil Beings ſuperior to the Souls of Men, *and that their Notion of it grew from the Nature of their Theology, which it was not only entirely conſiſtent with, but even abſolutely neceſſary to. I held it expedient to offer thus much in the Behalf of Truth, but otherwiſe I preſume the Gentlemen under Correction will not find themſelves much gall'd with the Stricture, when they conſider what Company they are in,* Origen, Euſebius, *and St.* Auſtin, *and that the Author has an Hypotheſis to ſerve: For my part, I am far from wondering at this ſanguine Aſſertion of the* Enquirer's, *how falſe ſoever; but I profeſs I am greatly ſurpriz'd with an Annotation of the learned Biſhop* Fell's *upon St.* Cyprian's *Piece of the* Vanity of Idols, *which I ſhall here give you in Dr.* Marſhal's *Words:* The Scriptures ſometimes uſe the Word δαίμονες with a *bad Meaning*, but more generally with a *good one*; and they expreſs the *bad one* by δαιμόνια. *The Difference here ſuggeſted betwixt* δαίμων *and* δαιμόνιον *has no manner of Founda-*

Foundation in Scripture, compare MATTH. viii. 31. *with* LUKE viii. 27. *and that Verſe of St.* LUKE *with* ℣ 29. *and as to the former Part of the Note, I muſt again reſt the Confutation of it upon the Arguments produc'd in the Letter.*

I have aſſerted the Book of Tobit *to have been tranſlated into* Greek, at *or* before *the Incarnation of our Bleſſed Saviour, becauſe it was us'd by* Polycarp, *who was a Diſciple of St.* John's, *and by* Clement *of* Alexandria: *I am ſince confirm'd in my Opinion by finding it ſo generally known and read in the ſecond Century: Before* Irenæus *wrote, who flouriſhed ſomewhat after the Middle of that Age, and had heard* Polycarp, *the* Ophites, *and* Sethians, *Heretics of the Spawn of the* Gnoſtics *and* Valentinians, *aſcribed the Prophets* Haggai *and* Tobit *to the Angel* Elœus: *and the* Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, *which are thought to have been firſt compil'd about the Cloſe of it, quote it in more Places than one: Theſe Teſtimonies added to thoſe of* Polycarp *and* Clement *may ſeem to put this Point out of Queſtion.*

As to the Senſe the Helleniſtic Jews *had affixed to the Word* Demon, Philo *in his Tract upon* Dreams, *repeats the Obſervation he has in his Piece about* Giants, *concerning the ſameneſs of the Words* Angel *and* Demon, *on this wiſe,* Ταύτας δαίμονας μὲ οἱ ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι, ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος ἀγγέλους εἴωθε καλεῖν, προσφυεστέρῳ χρώμενος ὀνόματι· *and there likewiſe you will*

will find the Word ψυχὴ *occurring in that large philoſophical Senſe I have mention'd.*

The Teſtimony of Joſephus *is alſo capable of being urged ſomewhat further; he tells us that* Solomon *left behind him ſeveral Forms of exorciſing* Demons: Joſephus *did not invent this; no, thoſe Forms had been long in uſe, as is imply'd in theſe Words:* Καὶ αὕτη ΜΕΧΡΙ ΝΥΝ παρ' ἡμῖν ἡ θεραπεία πλεῖσον ἰσχύϛ. *See alſo* MATTH. xii. 27. *neither are we to imagine that* Joſephus *was the firſt that pitch'd upon* Solomon *for the Author of theſe Incantations, (nothing of that being intimated in the Text) but rather that it was a receiv'd Opinion amongſt the* Jews, *long before his Time; from all which it follows, that the Notion of* Demons *being* evil Spirits *that entered and vexed the Bodies of Men, prevailed currently among the* Jews *before our Saviour made his Appearance. And, indeed, it appears evidently from the Fragments of the Apocryphal Books of* Enoch, *which are generally believ'd to have been forg'd before the Coming of* Chriſt, *that the* Jews *were then full of the Notion of* fallen or evil Angels, *the* Egregores *mention'd in thoſe Remains being* Angels, *and expreſly ſo call'd by ſundry Authors. See* Fabric. *Cod. Pſeud. Vet. Teſtam. tom.* i. *p.* 172, 179. *and the* Alex. *MS.* GEN. vi. 3. *and it is obſervable, that the Author of the* Teſtaments of the xii Patriarchs, *a Work of good Antiquity, thought he adapted himſelf to the Style and Opinions of the Ancients*

cients, when he ſpeaks of the πνεύματα πλάνης, πνεύματα τῆς Βελίαρ, *and of* δαίμονες πλάνης.

It were to be wiſh'd we had more of the Writings of thoſe Jews *that compos'd in* Greek *and flouriſh'd in that Interval of Time betwixt the framing the LXX Verſion of the Old Teſtament, and the giving of the New: For as they all made uſe of that Verſion, I make no Queſtion but we ſhould find them, ſo often as they had any Occaſion of treating of ſuch Matters, always applying the Word* Demon *in the ſame Senſe wherein the New Teſtament Writers, the* Greek *Tranſlator of the Book of* Tobit *and* Joſephus *have done: but alas! we have little more than the Names of ſome of them; and the Fragments of* Ezechiel *the Tragedian,* Demetrius *the Hiſtorian,* Ariſtobulus *the Peripatetic,* &c. *which are preſerv'd by* Clemens, Euſebius, *and St.* Cyril, *afford us nothing upon this Head, and conſequently do not ſupply one Inſtance of the uſe of the Word in Queſtion: The ſame may be ſaid of the* Apocryphal *Books of the Old Teſtament. Had we been able to have produc'd Authorities from any of the Remains of theſe Authors, it would have wrought more abundant Satisfaction, no doubt; but ſtill we can aſſuredly acquieſce in what we have, the* Greek *Verſion of* Tobit, *and the Quotations from* Joſephus *being ſufficient to convince any unprejudic'd Perſon of the Acceptation of the Word* Demon *for an* evil Spirit *amongſt the* Greek Jews; *eſpecially if it be conſider'd, that the* Jews *uni-*

univerſally, at that time of day, both believed Poſſeſſions to be real, and practis'd Exorciſms, for ſo it is written by St. MATTHEW, xii. 27. And if I by BEELZEBUB caſt out Devils, by whom do YOUR CHILDREN caſt them out? therefore they ſhall be your Judges.

I ſhall detain you no longer, than juſt to obſerve, that ſince the writing this Letter I have ſeen two Volumes of a noble Work of Mr. l'Abbé Banier's *upon the* Mythology and Fables of the Ancients: *'Tis matter of great Satisfaction to find this learned and ingenious Academician concurring in ſo many eſſential Points; ſuch as,* Homer's *adopting the Religious Syſtem of the Vulgar, the Traditional Notion of* Angels *amongſt the Ancients, that the* Demons *were thought an intermediate Order of Beings betwixt Gods and Men; together with* Plato's *Sentiments thereupon,* &c. *for all which I refer to the elaborate Author.*

April 13, 1739.

S. P.

AN

EXAMINATION

OF THE

Enquiry into the Meaning of Demoniacs *in the New Teſtament.*

SIR,

I HAVE perus'd your two *Enquiries* into the Meaning of *Demoniacs* in the New Teſtament, together with Mr. *Twells*'s Anſwers, and Mr. *Hutchinſon*'s Sermon on the oppoſite Side of the Queſtion; and I find, by a late Advertiſement in one of the public Papers, that notwithſtanding the Repreſentations and Animadverſions of theſe learned Gentlemen, the Controverſy is ſtill kept on foot, and, I preſume, not without your Knowledge and Approbation. You will not therefore be ſurpriz'd in finding yourſelf call'd upon again; but I hope will freely excuſe the Liberty I have taken of addreſſing you, and of deſiring you to re-conſider with me, the ſubject matter of your Pieces.

Now I entreat you, in Purſuance of thoſe Declarations wherein you profeſs yourſelf an honeſt Sear-

cher after Truth and a ſincere Lover of *Jeſus Chriſt* to diveſt yourſelf for a while of all Fondneſs for a favourite Opinion, and to become, as far as you can, an indifferent and an impartial Examiner in this Cauſe; *impræſentiarum ita tibi informandus eſt animus, ut libram teneas æquiſſimi judicis, nec in alteram partem propenſus incumbas, ne, non tam ex noſtris diſputationibus nata ſententia, quam ex tuis ſenſibus prolata videatur*[a].

Every body muſt own that you have ſpared no Pains to ſupport and adorn the Cauſe you have undertaken: Should you therefore find Reaſon, upon a cool Review, to alter your former Sentiments, you may ſtill retain that, which many a great Man before you has been contented with, namely, the Pleaſure and Satisfaction of having made the beſt of a bad Cauſe, and of having ſaid every thing that could be ſaid upon the Subject.

Your Scheme is, " That the ancient *Greeks* " meant by the Word *Demon* in general, *the Souls* " *of departed Men*; that they attributed certain " Diſeaſes to them, namely, ſuch as were attended with violent Diſtortions, Agitations, or in " general ſuch Sort of Affections, as could not " eaſily be accounted for; but as it is no where " ſatisfactorily prov'd, that *the Souls of the de-* " *ceas'd* have any Power over Mankind, the aſ- " cribing Diſeaſes to them is only an Hypotheſis; " for the ſeveral Deities or Demons, to whom the " Ancients imputed ſuch Diſtempers, were only " the imaginary, and not the real Cauſes thereof. " From whence, you think, it follows, that the " *Demoniacs* of the New Teſtament being Perſons " labouring under ſuch like Maladies, as the An- " cients were wont to aſcribe to their *Demons*,

[a] *Minuc. Felix*, c. 5.

" *Demons*

" *Demons* were not the true Cauſes of thoſe Diſor-
" ders, but the New Teſtament Writers made uſe
" of the Terms and Language of the Times;
" and conſequently, the ſeveral Poſſeſſions in the
" New Teſtament, when thoroughly conſider'd,
" imply only ſuch Diſeaſes as were uſually attri-
" buted to *Demons* in thoſe Days, that is, *Epi-*
" *lepſy*, and the various Species of Madneſs."

The Method I propoſe to purſue in trying the Merits of this Figurative Way of Interpretation (which, I truſt, has ſuffer'd no Injury by the foregoing Repreſentation) will be,

Firſt, To examine the Validity of your Obſervation, " that the ancient *Greeks* meant by the " Word *Demon* in general, the Souls of *departed* " *Men*."

Secondly, Whith what Reaſon and Juſtice, ſuppoſing you to have made good that Point, you apply their Notion of the Word to the Scriptures. And this will lead me,

Thirdly, To evince the true Scriptural Notion of it.

I ſuppoſe you will agree with me, that if the new Senſe you are pleaſed to put upon this Word, ſhould prove groundleſs; or, if in caſe it were never ſo clear and certain, yet if the Acceptation you contend for, is not applicable to the Books of the New Teſtament, then the Concluſion you draw, that by the *Demoniacs* of the New Teſtament are only intended ſuch Perſons, as labour'd under violent Diſtortions, or Agitations, or ſuch Sort of Affections as could not be accounted for, is entirely without Foundation. There will be no Occaſion for me therefore, to produce every particular Text, or to recite the ſeveral Caſes of the *Demoniacs*; and the leſs, becauſe I don't per-

ceive you any where pretend to ſay, that the reſpective Hiſtories are not ſufficiently intelligible, or conſiſtently explain'd upon the Footing of the literal received Interpretation; only you take an Exception to the general Doctrine, in following which we are not able, in your Opinion, to give a rational ſatisfactory Anſwer to the following Queſtion, to wit, "How it comes to paſs that "we meet with ſuch an extraordinary Number of "Perſons under the Power of Devils at the par-"ticular Time of our Saviour's Incarnation." This Difficulty was the Motive that induc'd you to make the Enquiry, and therefore I propoſe for a Concluſion to conſider, Whether this Motive alone was ſufficient to warrant you in attempting to ſtrike out this unuſual Method of Interpretation.

Your firſt Propoſition is, "That the ancient "*Greeks* meant by the Word *Demon* in general, "the Souls of *departed Men*;" an Obſervation, which, as you build much upon it, ought to be very ſubſtantially prov'd.

Now there being nothing in the Original Notion of the Word[b], to ſupport this novel Senſe, it is alledg'd that "*Homer* makes *Minerva*, after "ſhe had adviſed *Achilles* to lay aſide his Anger "againſt *Agamemnon*, retire to Heaven to the

[b] *Plato*'s Etymon in *Cratylo*, is, *quaſi* δαήμονες; which is follow'd by *Hierocles* in Aur. Carm. *Pythag. p.* 38. Ed. *Needham. Heſych.* and the *Etym. M. Poſidonius*'s in *Macrob.* Saturn. lib. i. c. 23. *ſive* ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου, *id eſt* καιομένου: *ſeu* ἀπὸ τοῦ δαιομένου, *hoc eſt* μεριζομένου; *Quia*, ſays he, *ex ætherea ſubſtantia parta atque diviſa qualitas illis eſt. Proclus* in *Heſiod* derives it, παρὰ τὸ δαῆναι τὰ πάντα, ἢ μερίζειν τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. See alſo the *Schol.* of *Homer*, Il. A. 222. *Heſych.* and the *Etym. M.* Theſe are Etymologies given by the Heathen themſelves, but are not a Jot more applicable to *departed Souls*, than to Beings of an higher Rank.

"Palace

" Palace of *Jupiter to the other Demons*, or *Gods*; " and who they were is plain, *viz. Apollo*, *Vulcan*, " *&c*[c]." This is indeed your ſecond Argument, but I chuſe to place it firſt, becauſe I think it is generally allow'd, that *Homer* is the oldeſt genuine *Greek* Writer that has come down to us; however he is older than *Heſiod*, whom you ſeem to favour[d]. The Force of the Argument is this, The ancient Heathen Gods are called *Demons*, who having been Men and Women, *Demon* muſt neceſſarily denote *a departed Soul*. 'Tis granted the Pagan Deities are ſtyled *Demons* both by *Homer* and others; nay *Apollo*, as *Lactantius* obſerves, calls himſelf a *Demon* in his Oracles[e]; but it does not follow from thence by any Logic, that Δαίμων, a Word in its own Nature implying no ſuch Thing, ſhould import a *departed Soul*: theſe miſerable Deities are likewiſe termed by *Homer*, ἀθάνατοι[f], but ſurely this Word does not for that Reaſon ſignify the *Souls of dead Men*. It will be expected, Sir, in this Caſe, that you ſhould ſhew from good Authority, that the Gods of the Heathen were *for that Reaſon* called *Demons*, *becauſe* they were departed Souls; which yet I apprehend it will be exceeding difficult to do. For tho' perhaps in Fact the principal Deities of the ancient *Greeks* at this Time, now that they had foregone the Worſhip of that older Sett, the Sun, Moon, and Stars[g], were but Men and Women who had been converſant here upon Earth, and afterwards, for their uſeful Inventions or great Exploits were deify'd upon their Deaths, (as is conſtantly inſiſted upon by the *Chriſtians* in their

[c] Enq. *p.* 3. [d] Enq. *p.* 2. Further Enq. *p.* 2.
[e] Lib. i. c. 7. [f] Il. B. 14. *& alibi paſſim.*
[g] *Prodicus* apud *Sext. Empiric. p.* 311. *&* 317. *Plato* in *Cratylo*, *p.* 52. Ed. *Baſ.*

ſeveral

ſeveral *Addreſſes* to the *Nations)* yet the Heathens themſelves were far from regarding them in that Light; as is evident from that *Euhemerus*, *Prodicus*, and *Perſeus*, whoſe Teſtimonies the Fathers are wont to cite in this Behalf, were eſteemed no better than Atheiſts on the Score of their Writings. Hence *Cicero:* [h] PERSEUS, *the Scholar of* ZENO, *ſays*, THEY *were eſteemed Gods, by whoſe means great Advantage accrued to common Life, by uſeful Inventions; and that thoſe uſeful Things themſelves had the Names of the ſeveral Deities; as if he was not content to ſay, theſe were the Inventions of the Gods, but were themſelves divine; but what could be more abſurd than to honour ſuch ſordid mean Things with the Name of Deity, or to place the defunct Sons of Men amongſt the Gods, the Worſhip of whom could only conſiſt in mourning for them?* And again, ſpeaking of *Prodicus* and *Euhemerus* [i], *And did not* PRODICUS *the* CEAN, *who eſteemed thoſe Things as Gods, which were uſeful to ſupport Life, take away all Religion? And are not They who ſay that*

[h] At Perſæus, ejuſdem Zenonis auditor, eos dicit eſſe habitos Deos, a quibus magna utilitas ad vitæ cultum eſſet inventa; ipſaſque res utiles & ſalutares Deorum eſſe vocabulis nuncupatas: ut ne hoc quidem diceret, illa inventa eſſe Deorum, ſed ipſa divina. Quo quid abſurdius, quam aut res ſordidas atque deformes Deorum honore adficere, aut homines jam morte deletos reponere in Deos, quorum omnis cultus eſſet futurus in luctu? *De Nat. Deor. l.* i. *c.* 15.

[i] Quid? Prodicus Ceus, qui ea, quæ prodeſſent hominum vitæ, Deorum in numero habita eſſe dixit, quam tandem Religionem reliquit? Quid? qui aut fortis, aut claros, aut potentis viros tradunt poſt mortem ad Deos perveniſſe, eoſque eſſe ipſos quos nos colere, precari, venerarique ſoleamus, nonne expertes ſunt Religionum omnium? quæ Ratio maxume tractata ab Euhemero eſt, quem noſter & intepretatus & ſecutus eſt, præter ceteros, Ennius. Ab Euhemero autem & mortes & ſepulturæ demonſtrantur Deorum. Utrum igitur hic confirmaſſe Religionem videtur, an penitus totam ſuſtuliſſe? *Ibid. l.* i. *c.* 42.

great

great and famous Men became Gods after their Deaths, and are the ſame whom we worſhip and pray to, void of all Religion? which Subject is chiefly handled by EUHEMERUS, *whom, with others, our* ENNIUS *has tranſlated and followed.* EUHEMERUS *has evinced both the* DEATHS *and* SEPULCHRES *of the Gods, but does he not ſeem by this rather to have deſtroyed Religion, than to have confirm'd it?* The Caſe is very plain as to *Euhemerus*, who was commonly called an *Atheiſt*, as both [k] *Clemens Alexandrinus* and [l] *Sextus Empiricus* witneſs; and I obſerve that *Theophilus Antiochenus* both calls him, and proves him one from his Doctrine [m]. It ſhould ſeem the firſt *Chriſtians* were charged by the *Pagans* with *Atheiſm*, as well for aſſerting the Manhood of their Deities, as for refuſing to worſhip them [n]. I am ſenſible that ſome Authors, of a different Character from *Euhemerus*, ſpeak openly enough of the Origine of their Deities; but who were theſe? *Cicero* [o], *Pliny* [p], *Servius* [q], and other *Latin* Authors, who were recent in Compariſon of the Times here ſpoken of, were Men of Letters, and wrote when the World was far advanced in Learning and Philoſophy; in ruder Ages, and with the Bulk of Mankind, Matters were far otherwiſe.

[k] Ὧν δὴ χάριν (ὃ γὸ ἀδαμῶς ἀποκρυπτέον) θαυμάζειν ἔπεισι μοι, ὅτῳ τρόπῳ Εὐήμερον τὸν Ἀκραγαντῖνον, καὶ Νικάνορα τὸν Κύπριον — ἀθέους ἐπικεκλήκασιν. *Clem. Alex.* tom. i. p. 20. Ed. *Oxon.*

[l] Εὐήμερος ἦν, ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Ἄθεος, φησὶν &c. *Sext. Empiric.* adverſus Mathemat. p. 311.

[m] Τὰ γὸ περὶ Εὐημέρου τοῦ ἀθεωτάτου περιττὸν ἡμῖν καὶ λέγειν· πολλὰ γὸ περὶ θεῶν τολμήσας φθέγξασθαι, ἔφαλον καὶ τὸ ἐξόλου μὴ εἶναι θεὸς, ἀλλὰ τὰ πάλαι αὐτομαλίσμῳ διοικεῖσθαι βέλεσ. *Theoph.* ad *Autolyc.* lib. iii. p. 210. Edit. *Oxon.* & vide *Sext. Empiric.* loco citato.

[n] *Tatian.* Orat. ad Græc. p. 97. Ed. *Oxon.*

[o] *Cic.* Tuſc. i. c. 12. [p] *Plin.* Nat. Hiſt. lib. ii. c. 7.

[q] *Serv.* ad Æn. viii. 319.

The

The Poets again, whom the Vulgar chiefly follow'd in Matters of Theology, never preſumed to teach that the Gods were but mere Men and Women; the Epithets and Attributes which *Homer* and *Heſiod* are continually beſtowing upon them, imply much more, as likewiſe do all thoſe Paſſages, wherein they are contradiſtinguiſh'd to Mortals. *Longinus* indeed obſerves, that *Homer* has made Gods of his Men, and Men of his Gods[r]; and *Cicero*, ſpeaking of the Gods eating and drinking, ſays, [s] *This is Homer's Invention, who has carried human Weakneſſes into Heaven.* Theſe Reflections are juſt, as will be ſeen preſently, but they do not prejudice our Aſſertion, as will then likewiſe appear.

Thirdly, *Homer*, who is the Perſon we are here principally concern'd with, did not frame a Theology himſelf, but follow'd a previouſly receiv'd Syſtem, as both Monſ. *Le Clerc* and Monſ. *Fraguier* remark[t]. The only Objection to this Opinion is the following Paſſage of *Herodotus: Whence each of the Gods came, whether they all exiſted always, and what their Dreſs and Figures were, was not known 'till the other Day, as I may ſay.* HOMER *and* HESIOD, *in my Opinion, liv'd not above four hundred Years ago; and yet theſe are they who invented the Grecian Theogony, giving the Gods their Names, their Rank, their ſeveral Arts, and their Figures. The Poets who are ſaid to have been before theſe, were* AFTER THEM, *as I take it*[v]. This is

[r] Περὶ ὕψους, § 9.

[s] Fingebat hæc Homerus, & humana ad Deos transferebat: divina mallem ad nos. *Tuſc.* i. c. 26.

[t] *Le Clerc* ad *Heſiod.* p. 3. Monſ. *Fraguier*'s Reflexions, Mem. de l'Acad. Royale des Inſcript. & Belles Lettr. tom. iv. See alſo *Feithii* Antiq. Homeric. p. 3.

[v] Ἔνθεν δὲ ἑκάστῳ τῶν θεῶν, εἴτε δ' ἀεὶ ἦσαν πάντες,

indeed,

indeed very ſtrong, if it be conſider'd withal, that the Author was appriz'd both of *Orpheus* and *Muſæus*[x]. But I ſuppoſe he look'd upon *Homer* and *Heſiod* as the earlieſt genuine Writers upon the Subject. I think it evident from the Place laſt quoted, where he ſpeaks of the male-Practices of *Onomacritus*, the noted Father of thoſe Poems that went under the Name of *Orpheus*, that he regarded the Pieces that bore the Names of *Orpheus* and *Muſæus* as ſpurious; which is the Reaſon that he here ſays, *that the Poets, who are ſaid to have been before* HOMER *and* HESIOD, *were* AFTER THEM, *as he took it.* It cannot be imagin'd, that he thought the real *Orpheus* and *Muſæus* more recent than *Homer*; it muſt be thoſe Works of theirs which were handed about and generally reputed more ancient than the Compoſitions of *Homer* and *Heſiod*, that he is ſpeaking of: And thus eſteeming *Homer* and *Heſiod* the oldeſt authentic Theogoniſts, he concluded too haſtily from thence, that the *Grecians* were without a Theology 'till they ſtarted up; which cannot be true, as is evident from the Conformity obſervable in *Homer* and *Heſiod*, which cannot poſſibly be accounted for upon that Suppoſition. From *Homer* then we learn the Opinions both of the more ancient and the later Pagans, and may juſtly infer further that he neither coined the Word *Demon*, nor firſt apply'd it to the Heathen Dei-

ὁκοῖοί τέ τινες τὰ εἴδεα, οὐκ ἐπιστέαλο μέχρι οὗ περ εἶν τε καὶ χθὲς, ὡς εἰπεῖν λέγω. Ησίοδον γὰρ καὶ Ομηρον ἡλικίην τετρακοσίοισι ἔτεσι δοκέω μευ πρεσβυτέρους γενέαθ, καὶ ὐ πλέοσι. Οὗτοι δέ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἕλλησι, καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες, καὶ τιμάς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες, καὶ εἴδεα αὐτῶν σημήναντες· οἱ δ' πρότερον ποιηταὶ λεγόμενοι τούτων τ' ὕστερον, ἐμοὶ γε δοκέειν, ἐγένετο τούτων. *Herodot.* l. ii. c. 53.

[x] See Book ii. c. 81. & vii. c. 6.

ties, but that from remoter Ages it was given to the *Dii majorum Gentium*. *Hesiod* has the Word as well as he, and it is plain he borrow'd it not from him, for his *Demons* are different from *Homer*'s. This will lead one to think that this Tribe of Deities were first admitted upon the Footing of those imperfect Notions the World then had of those intermediate Beings the *Angels*, who were generally understood to be of both Sorts, both Good and Bad. The *Demons* of *Homer* and *Hesiod*, and consequently those of the more ancient Pagans, were a Ministerial Order of Beings, acting under *the Father of Gods of Men*, and were both Good and Bad, as will appear in its proper Place. *Plutarch*, a Man of as extensive Knowledge as any amongst the Ancients, reckons this Notion of *Demons*, a very ancient Doctrine, carrying it up as high as *Zoroaster*; *They seem to me*, says he, *to have solved great and difficult Doubts, who have* PLACED THE *DEMONS* BETWEEN THE GODS AND MEN, *and found out what in some Sort uniteth and joineth us with them: Whether this be the Doctrine of the* MAGI *and* ZOROASTER, *or the* THRACIAN *Doctrine derived from* ORPHEUS, *or the* ÆGYPTIAN, *or* PHRYGIAN [y], *&c.* it was a very old Tradition, and the most learned knew not whence they had it. *Philo* writes, [z] *Those whom the other Philosophers call* DEMONS, MOSES *is wont to term* ANGELS,

[y] Εμοὶ δὲ δοκοῦσι πλείονας λῦσαι καὶ μείζονας ἀπορίας οἱ τὸ δαιμόνων γένος ἐν μέσῳ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τρόπον τινὰ τὴν κοινωνίαν ἡμῶν συνάγον εἰς ταὐτὸ καὶ συνάπτον ἐξευρόντες· εἴτε Μάγων τῶν τε περὶ Ζωροάστρην ὁ λόγος οὗτός ἐστιν, εἴτε Θρᾳκιος ἀπ' Ορφέως, εἴτ' Αἰγύπτιος, ἢ Φρύγιος, &c. *Plutarch.* de Def. Orac. & in Vita *Dionis*.

[z] *Philo* de Gigantibus, p. 192. Ed. *Turneb.* Οὓς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μωσῆς εἴωθεν ὀνομάζειν.

as

as if one and the ſame Rank of Creatures were intended by thoſe two Words: And ſo *Celſus* in *Origen*[a], *No God, O ye Jews and Chriſtians, nor Son of God ever came down amongſt us, or could come down; if ye mean Angels, who were theſe? Gods, or ſome other Order? Another Order, I ſuppoſe, namely* DEMONS. In another Place he expreſsly diſtinguiſhes the *Demons* from *dead Men.*[b] It would be tedious to accumulate Quotations and Teſtimonies of this Sort[c]. Theſe may ſuffice, being very clear for the Cauſe and Origin of the Gentile Polytheiſm, as likewiſe for the Reaſon of *Homer* and *Heſiod*'s giving this Name to the ſeveral Objects thereof.

I would aſk you, after what has been ſaid, whether you ſuppoſe, or can hope to convince any intelligent Reader, that, when *Apollo* calls himſelf a *Demon* in his Oracles, or, if you will, when the Prieſteſs calls him ſo, it is intended to ſignify to us, that he was *a departed Soul?* Or that *Homer*, when he calls the Gods *Demons*, meant to ſay, they were only *dead Men?* That, for Inſtance, when the Plague was brought upon the *Grecian* Army by *Apollo*, the Inflictor was underſtood both by himſelf and his Readers, to be *but the Soul of a Man?* The Antients, at this Time of Day, whatever they did afterwards, did not believe the Souls of dead Men, as ſuch, had any Power over the Liv-

[a] Θεὸς μὲν, ὦ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Χριστιανοὶ καὶ θεοῦ παῖς οὐδεὶς κατῆλθεν, οὔτε κατέλθοι· εἰ δέ τινας ἀγγέλους φατὲ, τίνας τούτους λέγετε, θεοὺς, ἢ ἄλλό τι γένος; ἄλλό τι, ὡς εἰκὸς, τοὺς δαίμονας. *Origen* contra *Celſ.* l. v. p. 232. See alſo p. 233. Lib. vii. p. 376.

[b] Ὅτι μὲν οὖν αὐτοὶ διελέγχουσι σαφῶς οὐ θεὸν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δαίμονας, ἀλλὰ νεκρὸν ζέβοντες. *Origen* contra *Celſ.* l. vii. p. 376. And in another Place he calls them, Σατράπας τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεοῦ, καὶ ὑπάρχους, καὶ στρατηγοὺς, καὶ ἐπιτρόπους. Lib. viii. p. 400.

[c] See Mr. *Mede*'s Works, Ed. 1677. p. 627. and Mr. *Hutchinſon*'s Sermon. *Havercamp* ad *Tertullian.* c. xlvi.

ing, ſo as to bring Diſeaſes upon them; on the contrary, *Feithius* will inform you, that they were thought to ſtand in need of the Living [d].

The Obſervation you have concerning the *Generation* of theſe Deities, [e] and the Pages ſpent in diſcovering "who the old Gods of the Heathen "were, and for what they were deified," [f] will not help you in this Caſe. For tho' we have authentic Relations, not only of the Deſcent, but alſo of the Lives and Actions of theſe reputed Gods; yet this will not lead us to the Diſcovery of the true Senſe and Meaning of the Word *Demon*. The Gods and Goddeſſes were Men and Women no doubt, but then they who gave them the Name of *Demons*, did not eſteem them as ſuch when they impoſed it, neither did they mean to convey to us any ſuch Notion by that Term. We know the Generation and the Tranſactions of theſe Deities, therefore they were Men and Women: The Reaſoning is juſt, and is urged with great Force and Pertinence upon the Pagans by the Fathers of the Church, and at laſt had the deſired Effect; but you cannot argue from thence to the Word *Demon*, any more than you can to the Word Θεὸς; it would be very abſurd to ſay, the Gods of the Heathen were Men, therefore the Word Θεὸς means the Soul of a Man. The Buſineſs is, 'till the Light of the Goſpel began to dawn upon them, and their Eyes were in a Manner forced open by the Brightneſs of its Beams, the Antients never could diſcern the manifeſt Abſurdity of their Theology, notwithſtanding the Pretences of the *Cretans* to the Grave of *Jupiter*, who were only reckon'd Liars for their Pains [g], or the Works of *Euhemerus* and the

[d] *Feithii* Antiq. Hom. lib. i. c. 15.
[e] Enq. p. 4. [f] Further Enq. p. 15. ſeq.
[g] *Callimach.* Hymn. in *Jov.* ℣ 7. & adnotat.

reſt

reſt of that Claſs. The Vulgar were always bad Divines, and the Poets, who took up their Syſtem, and were afterwards in their Turn follow'd by them, were no better. Θεογονία was not thought a Contradiction in Terms by them [h], nor Θεοὶ γενητοὶ by the Philoſophers [i]. The Poets only eſtabliſhed and ſanctified the Errors of the Multitude; and *Homer* himſelf, who ſo deſervedly claims the firſt Place amongſt the Poets, muſt be content to be ranked with the worſt of Theologers. Thinking Men, tho' the Vulgar did not, could eaſily diſcover his Fault in this Reſpect; not only *Lucian*, but *Pythagoras* and *Plato* [k], *Cicero* and *Longinus* [l], together with all thoſe who attempted to allegorize his Divinity. Now the Reaſon of this Conduct in this Prince of Poets is obvious enough; the Gods were neceſſary to his Plan, giving it both Ornament and Magnificence; he was glad to introduce them for that Reaſon; but then he could not alter them, but muſt take them as he found them: And as they had really been Men and Women, whoſe Hiſtories and Tranſactions were well known, and even their Deſcents, the Vulgar ſtill continued celebrating their Actions, and attributing to them the ſame good Qualities, whatever they were, after their *Apotheoſis*; and thus it came to paſs, that their Humanity adhered to them; but then, they were no longer regarded as Men;

[h] *Orpheus* either writ a *Theogony*, or one was very early father'd upon him. *Heſiod*'s is now extant; and thus *Homer*, Il. Ξ. 201.

Ωκεανόν τε θεῶν γένεσιν καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν.

[i] *Plato* in *Timæo*.

[k] *Pythagoras* ſaid he was puniſhed in *Tartarus* for the many unbecoming Things he had reported of the Gods. *Diog. Laert.* Vit. *Pyth.* p. 505. Ed. *Meib.* *Plato* baniſh'd him from his Commonwealth for the ſame Reaſon.

[l] *Cic.* Tuſc. i. c. 26. *Longinus* περὶ ὕψους § 9.

they

they were Gods now, even with all their Imperfections. Such a Proceeding muſt neceſſarily fill their Theology with infinite and ſhameful Inconſiſtencies; but ſtill they never perceiv'd it, neither was it in the Power of their Poets to help it; the Running of a few Years ſerv'd to conciliate a laſting Veneration for ſuch beneficent extraordinary Perſonages, and to fix a Belief in them, who were already poſſeſs'd of a Notion of a ſubordinate Rank of celeſtial Beings, that they were elevated into that Claſs, and were really become *Demons*. The Facility of the after Ages in ſwallowing ſuch Groſſneſſes in their Religious Syſtem, perhaps might be owing in ſome Meaſure to a Perſuaſion, that there was a Time when the Gods had frequent and moſt familiar Commerce with Mankind, even ſo as to be imagin'd upon that Account to have inhabited the Earth along with them, in like Manner as the Sylvan Gods, the *Fauns*, *Nymphs*, and *Satyrs* were believ'd afterwards to do[m]; or that Earth and Heaven at that Time were both but one Kingdom. There are ſtrong Traces of both theſe Opinions, amongſt the Ancients, eſpecially the Poets, who were the Fathers of their Mythology. *Heſiod* himſelf inſinuates, that the Gods and firſt Men were born and liv'd together[n], and ſo does *Virgil*[o], and

[m] Sunt mihi Semidei, ſunt Ruſtica Numina Nymphæ,
Faunique, Satyrique, & monticolæ Sylvani:
Quos quoniam Cœli nondum dignamur honore,
Quas dedimus, certe Terras habitare ſinamus.
Ovid. Metam. I. 192.

[n] Ὡς ὁμόθεν γεγάασι θεοὶ, θνητοί τ' ἄνθρωποι.
Heſiod. Ἔργ. & Ἡμερ. ℣ 109.

[o] Ille Deum vitam accipiet, Diviſque videbit
Permixtos Heroas, & ipſe videbitur illis.
Virg. Eclog. IV. 15.

Seneca.

Seneca[p]. It was ſuppos'd the Gods remov'd from Earth to Heaven, when Men began to be wicked: *Heſiod* writes that *Pudor* and *Nemeſis* were the laſt that went away, they not departing 'till the fifth Age[q]; *Ovid* delivers much the ſame of *Aſtræa* in the Iron Age[r]. See alſo *Virg.* Eclog. IV. 6. Georg. II. 473. and *Aratus* p. 19. Ed. *Oxon.*

As to the Government of the Gods, *Saturn* not only reign'd in Heaven in the Golden Age, as *Heſiod* has it, but on Earth too, if we may believe *Virgil*[s]; *Cæcilius* in *Minucius Felix* aſſents to this: *To believe the Ancients, who in the Infancy of the World were ſo highly favour'd, as to have the Gods either for their Benefactors or Governors*[t]: So I render this Paſſage, rather than follow Mr. *Reeves*, who gives it thus, *To pin our Faith upon our Forefathers, who in the Times of Simplicity and Infancy of the World,* DID USE TO MAKE GODS, EITHER OF PUBLIC BENEFACTORS OR OF KINGS. *Cæcilius* has the Part of the Pagan in the Dialogue, and never would have admitted that; his Antagoniſt *Octavius* afterwards urges it upon him: *Our Anceſtors, while they religiouſly honour their* KINGS, *while they deſire after their Departure to behold them*

p ——————— Hoc equidem reor
Vixiſſe ritu, prima quos mixtos Deis,
Profudit ætas. ——————— *Senec.* Hippolyt. ℣ 525.

q *Heſiod.* Ἔργ. & Ἡμερ. ℣ 197.

r *Ovid.* Metam. I. 149.

s Primus ab Æthereo venit Saturnus Olympo,
Arma Jovis fugiens, & regnis exul ademptis.
Is genus indocile, ac diſperſum montibus altis
Compoſuit, legeſque dedit, Latiumque vocari
Maluit, his quoniam latuiſſet tutus in oris.
Aurea quæ perhibent, illo ſub Rege fuerunt
Sæcula; ſic placidâ populos in pace regebat.
Virg. Æn. VIII. ℣ 319. ſeq.

t Prioribus credere, qui in ipſius mundi Natalibus, meruerunt Deos vel faciles habere, vel reges. *Min. Felix.* c. v.

in

in their Images, and delight to preſerve their Images in Statues; what was at firſt taken up for their own Solace, was at length made a Matter of Religion[v], *&c.* I refer for further Satisfaction on this Head, to *Dan. Heinſius*'s Introduction to *Heſiod*'s Ἔργ. & Ἡμερ. *cap.* ix. and Mr. *Shuckford*'s Connexion of *Sacred* and *Profane* Hiſtory, *vol.* i. *p.* 28.

Others again would content themſelves with this enormous Fabric of Superſtition, merely becauſe it was conſecrated by its Antiquity; they would not reject nor even examine it, becauſe it had ſerved their Anceſtors, and was handed down, as a ſacred *Depoſitum* from them. *Cæcilius* harangues upon this, in the Chapter juſt now cited, and *Juſtin Martyr* begins his Paræneticaſ Oration with an Endeavour to remove this unreaſonable Prejudice, and you will find *Clemens Alexandrinus* arguing againſt it in his[x].

But after all, the Blindneſs and Infatuation of the Ancients was ſo great and deplorable in this Article, eſpecially amongſt the *Egyptians*, ſome of whoſe Deities grew in their Gardens[y], that in my humble Opinion it muſt be reſolv'd into ſomewhat higher than mere naturaſ Cauſes.

Another Argument which you bring in Proof of your Aſſertion, "That the ancient *Greeks* "meant by the Word *Demon* in general, the Souls "of *departed Men*," runs thus, "*Heſiod* tells us,

[v] Dum reges ſuos colunt religioſe, dum defunctos eos deſiderant in imaginibus videre, dum geſtiunt eorum memorias in ſtatuis detinere, ſacra facta ſunt, quæ fuerant aſſumpta ſolatia; denique & antequam commerciis orbis pateret, & antequam gentes ritus ſuos moreſque miſcerent, unaquæque natio conditorem ſuum, aut ducem inclytum, aut reginam pudicam ſexu ſuo fortiorem, aut alicujus muneris vel artis repertorem venerabatur, ut civem bonæ memoriæ: ſic & defunctis præmium & futuris debatur exemplum. *Minuc. Felix*, c. xx.

[x] *Clem. Alex.* tom. i. p. 57. ſeq. [y] *Juvenal* Sat. xv.

"that

" that in the " Golden Age[z], when *Saturn* reign-
" ed in Heaven, Men lived like Gods, free from
" Evils, and died juſt as if they had fallen aſleep:
" Theſe were made *Demons*, *good* Beings, the
" Guards of mortal Men; they obſerve the Good
" and Evil done here; and cloathed with Air,
" they are every where on Earth, numberleſs,"
" *&c.* Theſe were *good* Beings, and the Authors
" of *Good* to Mankind. The *Souls* of theſe Men,
" after they were remov'd from this earthly Life,
" were made the Inſpectors of human Affairs,
" and as they *diſpenſed good* Things to Men, they
" were called *Demons.*[a]" You ſeem very willing to ſay, that the *Demons* of the ancient *Greeks* were originally all *good* Beings[b]; but I obſerve you are under ſome Confuſion in this Matter; in the Further Enquiry[c], you tell us the *Grecians* had their Notion of *Demons* from the *Ægyptians*, who held an *evil Demon*, as well as a good one; but yet you there aſſert, " That at firſt the *Greeks* knew of
" no other than *good Demons.*" So here you collect that *Heſiod*'s *Demons* were *good Beings*; but in the Further Enquiry, *p.* 3. you own *Heſiod* uſes δαιμονίη in a *bad* Senſe; and you there confeſs the

[z] Ὡς ὁμόθεν γεγάασαι θεοὶ, θνητοί τ' ἄνθρωποι,
Χρύσεον μὲν πρώτιστα γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
Ἀθάνατοι ποίησαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες.
Οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ Κρόνου ἦσαν, ὅτ' οὐρανῷ ἐμβασίλευεν.
when this Race died,
Τοὶ μὲν δαίμονές εἰσι, Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλὰς,
Ἐσθλοὶ, ἐπιχθόνιοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
Οἵ ῥα φυλάσσουσίν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
Ἠέρα ἑσσάμενοι, πάντῃ φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἶαν,
Πλουτοδόται· καὶ τοῦτο γέρας βασιλήϊον ἔσχον.
Again, Τεὶς μὲν μύριοι εἰσὶν, ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ
Ἀθάνατοι Ζηνὸς, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων, &c.
Heſiod. Ἔργ. & Ἡμερ. 109. ſeq.

[a] Enq. *p.* 2. [b] Further Enq. *p.* 2, 3, 15, 19, 41.
[c] Pag. 41.

ſame of *Homer:* As to *Homer* the Caſe is plain enough [d]; indeed you ſay that "κακὸς δαίμων in "Him is not an *evil Spirit*, or a *Devil*, as we un- "derſtand that Word; but an *adverſe Demon*, one "that was the Cauſe of Misfortunes, or that hin- "dered Succeſs to ſome Men [e]." It is not ſuppos'd that the Poet had exactly the ſame Idea of an *evil Spirit* that we now have; but it is evident he thought ſome *Demons* were the Authors of Vexation and Trouble, and inflicted Diſeaſes upon Mankind, and whoſe Buſineſs and Employment it was to do ſuch Things, which is enough for me. As to others, *Pythagoras* and *Ocellus Lucanus* [f] both acknowledged *evil Demons*, and *Empedocles* does the ſame in *Plutarch* [g]; as alſo does *Zaleucus* in *Stobæus*. People will be apt to think *Origen* a very good Judge in this Matter, even though your Opinion lyes in the oppoſite Scale, *Not only we Chriſtians ſay the* DEMONS *are* EVIL, *but almoſt all others who hold ſuch Beings*, ſays he [h], and the common People in *Philo*'s Time talk'd as currently of *evil Demons* as they did of *good ones* [i]; *Homer*

[d] Ὡς δ' ὅταν ἀπάσι βίοτον παίδεσι φανείη
Πατρὸς, ὅς κ' νόσῳ κεῖται κρατερὰ ἄλγεα πάσχων,
Δηρὸν τηκόμενον, (συγεροὶ δέ οἱ ἔχραε δαίμων) &c.
Homer. Odyſſ. E. 394.
Πῶς ἦλθες, Ὀδυσεῦ; τίς τοι κακὸς ἔχραε δαίμων;
Ibid. K. 64.

κακὸς δαίμων is the ſame as συγερὸς δαίμων. Of this Sort were Ερινὺς and Ἄτη, ἣ πάντας ἀᾶται, and whom *Jupiter* threw headlong out of Heaven, Il. T. 126. and ſee *Juſt. Mart.* Paræ- netic. p. 109. Ed. *Oxon.* When Men became obnoxious to the Gods, they fell into the Hands of ſuch *Demons* as theſe, Odyſſ. K. 73.

[e] Further Enquiry, p. 3. [f] See below.

[g] *Plutarch.* περὶ ἀθυμίας. p. 474. Ed. *Par.*

[h] Φαῦλος ὁ δαίμονας, ὃ μόνοι λέγομεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σχεδὸν πάντες, ὅσοι δαίμονας τιθέασιν εἶναι. *Orig.* c. *Celſ.* lib. viii. p. 377.

[i] Ὥσπερ ὁ ἀγαθὸς δαίμονας καὶ κακοὺς λέγουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ ψυχὰς ὁμοίως, ὅταν καὶ ἀγγέλους. *Philo* de Gigantibus, p. 192.

uſes

uſes ὀλβιοδαίμων, and *Heſiod* εὐδαίμων, which ſhews it is an indifferent Word, ſuſceptible both of a good and a bad Senſe. See *Heſychius v.* δαιμόνιε, and *Etym. M. v.* δαιμόνιος. You obſerve that all *Plato*'s *Demons* are good Beings[k], but it muſt certainly be an *evil Demon* that mixed a preſent Pleaſure with Evil[l]: *Plato* had this Notion of an *evil Demon* from the *Pythagoreans*[m]. But to go upon *Heſiod*; he, it ſeems, as well as *Homer*, held *Demons*; but he thought they were different from *Minerva*, *Apollo*, *&c.* and were the Men of the Golden Age: This therefore is his Method of accounting for thoſe ſubaltern Beings which he met with in the Theology of the Vulgar; a Method peculiar to himſelf; for I think no extant Author ſince him, though many have taken Occaſion to mention the Golden Age[n], have ever aſſerted that the Men thereof became *Demons*; (as to *Plato*, it will appear, when we come down to him, that he ſpeaks not his own, but *Heſiod*'s Sentiments;) the Reaſon was, that though they believ'd and deliver'd many incoherent ridiculous Things concerning their Gods, yet they never could bring themſelves to ſay that the Objects of their Worſhip were θνητοὶ ἄνθρωποι, *mortal Men*. *Oenomaus* therefore in *Euſebius* rightly calls them Ἡσιοδεῖοι θεοὶ. *Heſiod* being then ſingular in this Point, it may be proper to enquire what could lead ~~them~~ into this Notion. Now I look upon the Golden Age as a mere Invention of his[o]; but after

[k] Further Enquiry, p. 15, 19.

[l] Ἔστι μὲν δὴ καὶ ἄλλα κακά· ἀλλὰ τις ἔμιξε δαίμων τοῖς πλείστοις ἐν τῷ παραυτίκα ἡδονὴν, οἷον κόλακι δεινῷ θηρίῳ καὶ βλάβῃ μεγάλῃ, ὅμως ἐπέμιξεν ἡ φύσις ἡδονήν τινα οὐκ ἄμουσον. *Plato* in *Phæd.* p. 200. See *Clem. Alex.* tom. ii. p. 702.

[m] See below.

[n] *Aratus*, *Virgil*, *Ovid*, *Seneca*, *Juvenal*, &c.

[o] *Le Clerc* ad *Heſiodi* Theogon. ℣ 211.

he had thought fit to introduce this, there was no other way for him to dispose of these Men; it was the *Golden Age*, when *Saturn* reign'd, when as yet there were no *Inferi*[p]. The Brothers *Jupiter*, *Neptune*, and *Pluto* had not yet divided the Universe; and as there was no Place of Punishment, there was no *Elysium*. And thus it was, that the Poet not knowing where to place the Souls of these Persons, and not troubling himself about the Expression θνητοὶ ἄνθρωποι, *mortal Men*, or, as I rather think, not perceiving the Inconsistency of that with the Canonization of this Race of Men, adventur'd to make *Demons* of them. We will now consider how far the Sense of the Word *Demon* can be gather'd from this notable Passage. The Men of the Golden Age became *Demons*; but how was that? as having been Men, so that the Word *Demon* shall signify *the Soul of a Man?* By no means; it was *by the Will of the great Jupiter*[q]; in like manner as *Plato* speaks of his created Gods, where he introduces the Creator addressing them thus, *Wherefore, since ye have had a Beginning, ye are not immortal nor absolutely indissoluble, but nevertheless you shall not be dissolv'd, nor taste of Death,* THROUGH MY WILL, *which is more powerful than that Law by which you began to be*[r]. The Heathen in *Tertullian*'s Time preten-

p ——— nondum aliquis sortitus triste profundi
Imperium, aut Sicula torvus cum conjuge Pluton.
Nec rota, nec Furiæ, nec saxum, aut vulturis atri
Pœna, sed infernis hilares sine Regibus umbræ.
Juvenal. Sat. xiii. 49. seq.

q Τοὶ μὲν δαίμονές εἰσι, Διὸς μεγάλου διὰ βουλάς.
Hesiod. Ἐργ. & Ἡμερ. ℣ 122.

r Δι' ἃ καὶ ἐπείπερ γεγένησθε, ἀθάνατοι μὲν οὐκ ἐστὲ, οὐδ' ἄλυτοι τοπάμπαν, οὔτι μὲν δὴ λυθήσεσθέ γε, οὐδὲ τεύξεσθε θανάτου μοίρας, τῆς ἐμῆς βουλήσεως μείζονος ἔτι δεσμοῦ καὶ κυριωτέρου λαχόντες ἐκείνων, οἷς ὅτ' ἐγίγνεσθε συνεδεῖσθε. *Plato in Timæo*, p. 481. Ed. *Bas.*

ded

ded that Men might become Gods, *And becauſe* [s] *you have not the Hardineſs to deny but that your Gods were once Men, but yet ſtand up for their being turned into Gods, I ſhall now conſider the Reaſons for ſuch a Perſuaſion.* When they were pinch'd with the Teſtimonies the *Chriſtians* alledg'd in Proof of their Gods being Mortals, this it ſeems was their uſual Refuge; they ſaid, [t] *the conferring of Godſhips was intended for the rewarding of Virtue.* The Men of this Age, according to *Heſiod*, *were very good*, and were rewarded for their Goodneſs by being advanced upon their Deaths to the Order and Dignity of *Demons*; the *Demonſhip* was the Reward of their Virtue[v], and when they are called *Demons*, it is not in reſpect of what they had been, but what they now were, ἀθάναλοι Ζηνὸς, φύλακες θνήτων ἀνθρώπων[x], *the Immortals of Jupiter, and the Guardians of mortal Men.* I preſume the Heroes, *Bacchus*, *Hercules*, *&c.* were not eſteemed by their Worſhippers after their Immortalization, as the Souls of *mere dead Men*, but as elevated by the Favour of the ſupreme *Jupiter*, to a Rank of Godſhip, in Conſequence, and upon the Account of their extraordinary Virtue[y]. This Interpretation is entirely agreeable to *Proclus*,

[s] Et quoniam ſicut homines fuiſſe non audetis negare, ita poſt mortem Deos factos inſtituiſtis aſſeverare, cauſas quæ hoc exegerint, retractemus. *Tertull.* Apolog. c. xi.

[t] Reſpondentes collationem divinitatis meritorum remunerandorum fuiſſe rationem. *Ibid.*

[v] 'Tis term'd by the Poet *regius honor*, *regia dignitas*, ℣ 126. which, as *Grævius* obſerves from *Plutarch*, was becauſe it was Βασιλικόν τι εὖ ποιεῖν; this ſhews us what *Macrobius* means when in his Commentary on *Scipio*'s Dream, *l.* i. *c.* 9. he calls the Men of this Age *priſcos Reges.*

[x] *Heſiod.* Ἔργ. & Ἡμερ. ℣ 253.

[y] Hac arte Pollux & vagus Hercules
Enisus arces attigit igneas. *Hor.* Od. iii. 3.

whoſe

whose Words are, Τȣ̀ς μεθισαμένȣς τȣ̃ ζῆν, ὄντας δὲ φύλακας τȣ̃ βίȣ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, δαίμονας καλεῖ; the Sense of which Annotation is not, as is suggested by you[z], that he calls them *Demons*, *because they were remov'd from this Life*, but because they were φύλακες τȣ̃ βίȣ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *the Guardians of mortal Men*; the Particle δὲ subjoined to the Participle of the Verb Substantive, evidently shews this to be the Cause of it, which agrees both with the Words of the Poet[a], and with his own Etymon[b]. The Scholiast of *Homer* concurs; he says *Hesiod* calls those *Demons who were remov'd from this Life*, but not in *general*, or for *that Reason*, but that particular Set of Men who lived in the *Golden Age*, and were made the *Guardians of mortal Men*, which are *Hesiod*'s Words, the Words whereon he grounds his Observation[c].

So far you are pleas'd to go with the Poets; to whom you add *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and *Josephus*, the Consideration of whose Testimonies, if you will give me leave, I would reserve, without Detriment to the Enquiry, for a properer Place. I pass on to the Further Enquiry, where you introduce the Philosophers *Thales*, *Pythagoras*, and *Plato*: "THALES's *Notion concerning* DEMONS, *you say*, *was*, that the World[d] was full of "them. It is observ'd of him, that he *first* "*taught that Souls were* immortal[e]. *Plutarch* tells "us, that *Thales*'s Notion was, that *Demons*

[z] Enq. *p.* 3. [a] φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

[b] Παρὰ τὸ δαῆναι τὰ πάντα, ἢ μερίζειν τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰ κακὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

[c] Ησίοδος δὲ δαίμονάς φησι, τȣ̀ς ἐκ τȣ̃ ζῆν μεταστάντας, ὄντας δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς τȣ̃ Χρόνȣ βασιλείας, τȣ̃ χρυσȣ̃ γένȣς, λέγων αὐτȣ̀ς δαίμονας φύλακας θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Schol. Brev. Hom.* Il. A. 222.

[d] Τὸν κόσμον ἔμψυχον καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη. *Laert. Thales.*

[e] Αὐτὸν πρῶτον εἰπεῖν φασιν ἀθανάτȣς τὰς ψυχάς. *Ibid.*

"were

" [f] were *ſpiritual Subſiſtencies*; and *Heroes*, *Souls* " *ſeparated from Bodies*. He had a Notion that " all the World was *animated*, or had a Soul; and " that the Soul was that which cauſed Motion; " he therefore imagined a *Loadſtone* [g] *to have a* " *Soul*, becauſe it *attracted or moved Iron*. I think " it hard to ſay what he meant by the Worlds " being animated. *Ariſtotle* thinks that he meant " that a Soul was *mixed* [h] *with or pervaded the U-* " *niverſe*, *from whence*, *perhaps*, *he thought all* " *Things to be full of Gods*. There ſeems to be no " Difference in ſaying that the World was full of " *Demons*, and that it was full of *Gods*." It appears from your own Account of the matter, that *Thales* regarded the *Demons* as ſpiritual Subſtances, diſtinct from human Souls; for he diſtinguiſhes them from the *Heroes*, whom he deemed to be *Souls ſeparated from Bodies*; it is plain again, that if there be no Difference in ſaying that the World was full of *Demons*, and that it was full of *Gods*, that *Demons* and *Gods* were ſynonymous Words with him, and conſequently the former could not be *the Souls of Men*. Let us hear *Pythagoras*: " Cotemporary many Years with *Thales* was *Py-* " *thagoras*, who had much the ſame Notions with " him, only he appropriated to the *Air*, what the " other ſaid of the *World*: He taught, " that " the *Air* [i] was full of Souls, and that theſe were

[f] Δαίμονας ὑπάρχειν οὐσίας ψυχικὰς, καὶ Ἥρωας τὰς κεχωρισμένας ψυχὰς τῶν σωμάτων. *Plut.* de Placit. Philoſ. *l.* i. *c.* 8.

[g] Ἔοικε καὶ Θαλῆς — κινητικόν τι τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπολαμβάνειν, εἴπερ τὸν λίθον ἔφη ψυχὴν ἔχειν, ὅτι τὸν σίδηρον κινεῖ. *Ariſt.* de Anima, *l.* i. *c.* 2.

[h] Ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ δέ τινες αὐτὴν [ψυχὴν] μεμίχθαί φασιν· ὅθεν ἴσως καὶ Θαλῆς φήθη πάντα πλήρη θεῶν εἶναι. Ibid. *c.* 8.

[i] Εἶναι πάντα τὸν ἀέρα ψυχῶν ἔμπλεον καὶ τούτους τοὺς δαίμονας τε καὶ Ἥρωας νομίζειν· καὶ ὑπὸ τούτων πέμπεσθαι ἀνθρώποις τούς τε ὀνείρους, καὶ τὰ σημεῖα νόσου τε καὶ ὑγιείας· καὶ δὴ μόνον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,

" what

" what were deemed to be *Demons* and *Heroes*;
" that Dreams were ſent to Men by theſe, and
" alſo the Signs of Sickneſs and Health; and not
" only to Men, but alſo to Sheep and other Cat-
" tle: That Expiations, Averruncations, and all
" Divination and Omens, and the like, were to
" be referred to them; that when any one died,
" *Mercury* was the Director and Guide of their
" Souls: Such as were pure he conducted to the
" higher Regions, that ſuch as were impure might
" not approach them; and as to the impure,
" they were bound by the Furies in Chains that
" could not be broke." *Pythagoras* look'd upon the Air to be full of Souls, meaning by *Soul*, according to the Language of the Philoſophers, a ſpiritual Subſtance in general, of which Kind, GOD, in his Opinion was[k]. He makes a Difference between Demons and Heroes, as *Thales* did, and the very ſame I make no doubt, for they had both one Maſter, *Pherecydes* the *Syrian*; nay *Pythagoras* heard *Thales* himſelf, as *Jamblichus* witneſſes[l]. If this was the Caſe, the Heroes, and not the Demons, were *the departed Souls of Men*; and the pure Souls who were conducted to the higher Regions by *Mercury*, were of the firſt Sort (if of that) and not of the ſecond: But be this as it will, he was far from confounding *Demons* with the *Souls of Men* (though he might eſteem them both of the ſame Nature, *viz.* ſpiritual Subſtances) for he reckon'd them more than one Degree ſu-

ἀλλὰ καὶ προβάσεις, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις κτήνεσιν. Τὸν Ἑρμῆν, ἔφασκε εἶναι τῶν ψυχῶν — καὶ ἄγειν μὲν τὰς καθαρὰς ἐπὶ τὸν ὕψιστον. τὰς δὲ ἀκαθάρτους μήτε ἁπτεσθαι τῶν καθαρῶν, μήτε ἀλλήλων, δεῖσθαι δ' ἐν ἀῤῥήκτοις δεσμοῖς ὑπὸ Ἐρινύων. *Laert. Pythag.*

[k] *Juſt. Mart.* Cohort. p. 85. *Clem. Alex.* tom. i. p. 62. & Adnotat. *Cicero* de Nat. Deor. *l.* i. *c.* 11. *Min. Felix*, *c.* xix. *Porphyr.* vit. *Pythag.* § 41, aliique.

[l] *Jamblich.* vit. *Pythag.* p. 9.

perior,

perior, *declaring*, as *Jamblichus* relates, *both in the World, and in Life, and in Cities, and in Nature, that which preceeds to be more honourable than that which follows; as the Eaſt to be more honourable than the Weſt, — the Gods than the Demons, the Demons than the Demigods, the Demigods than Men*[m]." This ſhews he thought the *Demons* next in Rank to the *Gods*; and I find *Ocellus Lucanus*, who was a *Pythagorean*, has given us a like Arrangement, *Gods*, *Demons*, and *Men*[n]. It ſeems the old Philoſophers, *Thales*, *Pythagoras*, and *Ocellus*, as well as the old Poets *Homer* and *Heſiod*, had a Notion of a middle Rank of Creatures intervening betwixt GOD and us, from whenceſoever they had it; which makes it ſtill the more probable, that the Demonology of the Ancients was founded in the imperfect Traditions they had concerning Angels. I obſerve you are pleas'd to think the Heathen World knew nothing of Angels[o]; by which if you mean they entertained not the ſame preciſe Notions of them that we and the Eccleſiaſtical Writers do, I agree with you; but then this does not hinder but the *Demons*, who were a Part of the Theology of the *Gentiles* before *Homer* and *Heſiod*, and conſequently long before *Thales* and *Pythagoras*, might be originally introduced in the Place of the Angels, of whom the more early Ages might have ſome ſcatter'd obſcure Hints. The Author of the Verſes, which many of the Heathens themſelves attributed to *Orpheus*, mentions Angels, as *Grotius* obſerves[p]: And

[m] Ἀποφαίνων, ἔν τε τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τῷ βίῳ καὶ ταῖς πόλεσι, καὶ τῇ φύσῃ μᾶλλον τιμώμενον τὸ προηγούμενον, ἢ τὸ τοῦ χρόνου ἑπόμενον· οἷον τὴν ἀνατολὴν τῆς δύσεως — τοὺς μὲν θεοὺς τῶν δαιμόνων, ἐκείνους δὲ τῶν ἡμιθέων, τοὺς Ἥρωας δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Jamblich.* vit. *Pythag.* p. 28. Edit. *Kuſteri.*

[n] *Ocellus Lucanus*, p. 532. Ed. *Galei.*

[o] Further Enquiry, p. 9.

[p] *Grotius* ad *Matth.* i. 20.

ſhould it be objected that *Thales* and *Pythagoras* might get the Hint from the Eaſt, I aſk, why the more ancient *Greeks* might not do ſo too: *Cadmus* was a *Phœnician*, and *Orpheus* made a Tour into *Ægypt*. But to return, *Pythagoras* certainly made a Difference betwixt *Demons* and the *Souls of Men*; *Impure Souls*, ſays he, *were bound by the Furies in Chains that could not be broke*. Now the *Pythagoreans* held *evil Demons*, as is evident from *Ocellus Lucanus*[q], *Empedocles*[r], and the Author quoted by *Origen*[s]: The Exiſtence of an evil Genius or Demon, that influenced Men to Wickedneſs, was the *diſtinguiſhing Doctrine* of *Pythagoras* and his School[t]. But more directly, *Pythagoras* himſelf held *evil Demons* according to *Laertius*, for they muſt be evil Demons that ſent νόσκς, *Diſeaſes*, to Mankind and Cattle; ſo I read that Paſſage of *Laertius*, καὶ ὑπὸ τούτων πέμπεσθαι ἀνθρώποις τάς τε ὀνείρκς, καὶ τὰ σημεῖα νόσκ τε καὶ ὑγιείας· καὶ ἐ μόνον ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ προβάτοις, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις κλήνεσιν. Vit. *Pythag.* p. 514. Ed. *Amſt.* How could the Signs of Sickneſs and Health be ſent to Cattle, who are incapable of taking Notice of them? I read, τάς τε ὀνείρκς καὶ τὰ σημεῖα, νόσκς τε καὶ ὑγιείας, reſtraining the two latter to the Cattle; and this Conjecture I ſince find confirm'd by Cod. *Cant.* which expreſsly has it ſo: See *Var. Lect.* at the End of *Meibomius*'s Edition. *Lactantius*, ſpeaking of the Demons, joyns Diſeaſes and Dreams together, juſt in the ſame manner, *qui quoniam ſunt ſpiritus tenues & incomprehenſibiles, inſinuant ſe corporibus hominum, & occulte in viſceribus operati valetudinem vitiant, morbos citant, ſomniis animos terrent, &c.* lib. ii. c. 14. and ſo St. *Cyprian*, *Vitam turbant*,

[q] *Ocellus Lucanus*, pag. 532. Ed. *Galei.*

[r] *Plutarch* περὶ Εὐθυμίας.

[s] *Origen* contra *Celſ.* l. vii. p. 335, 336.

[t] Mr. *Warburton*'s Divine Legation of *Moſes*, tom. i. p. 125.

SOMNOS *inquietant, irrepentes etiam in corporibus occulte mentes terrent, membra diſtorquent,* VALETUDINEM FRANGUNT, MORBOS LACESSUNT, *Cyprian de Idol. Vanit. p.* 206. Ed. *Pariſ.* and ſee Dr. *Davies*'s Annotations on *Min. Felix, p.* 136. As to the Argument, *Origen*'s *Pythagorean* concluded that *Homer* believ'd there were evil Demons, becauſe of the Plague ſent among the *Greeks* by *Apollo. Orig. contra Celſ. l.* vii. *p.* 335. But *Pythagoras*'s Notion may be beſt learnt from his famous *Metempſychoſis*; the Paſſage of *Laertius*, wherein he is ſaid to have taught, *that when any one died,* MERCURY *was the Director and Guide of their Souls, &c.* is hardly compatible with the Tranſmigration of Souls, which however was certainly a Doctrine of his: According to this, the Souls of Men were immortal, and were continually circulating out of one Body into another; and if the Souls were employ'd on this manner, his *Demons* muſt be different from them.

From *Plato* two Places are produc'd which are thought very full to your Purpoſe, the firſt from the *Cratylus*, runs thus: "Do you know, ſays "*Socrates*[v], what Beings thoſe are which *Heſiod*

[v] Οἶσθα δὲ τίνας φησὶν Ἡσίοδος εἶναι τοὺς δαίμονας; Ερ. οὐκ οἶδα. Σω. ἆρ' ὅτι χρυσοῦν γένος τὸ πρῶτον φησὶ γενέσθαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων; Ερ. Οἶδα τοῦτό γε. Σω. Λέγει τοίνυν περὶ αὐτοῦ,

Αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ Μοῖρ' ἐκάλυψε,
Οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἁγνοὶ ἐπιχθόνιοι καλέονται,
Εσθλοὶ, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Ερ. Τί δὲ δή; Σω. Ὅτι οἶμαι ἐγὼ λέγειν αὐτὸν τὸ χρυσοῦν γένος, οὐκ ἐκ χρυσοῦ πεφυκὸς, ἀλλ' ἀγαθόν τε καὶ καλόν· τεκμήριον δέ μοι ἐστὶν, ὅτι καὶ ἡμᾶς φησὶ ζιδηροῦν εἶναι γένος. Ερ. Ἀληθῆ λέγεις. Σω. Οὐκοῦν καὶ τὸ νεῶ οἴει ἂν φάναι αὐτὸν, εἴ τις ἀγαθός ἐστιν, ἐκεῖνο δὲ χρυσοῦν γένος εἶναι; Ερ. Εἰκός γε. Σω. Οἱ δ' ἀγαθοὶ, ἄλλό τι ἢ φρόνιμοι; Ερ. Φρόνιμοι. Σω. Τοῦτο τοίνυν πάντως μᾶλλον λέγει ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ τοὺς δαίμονας, ὅτι φρόνιμοι καὶ δαήμονες ἦσαν, δαίμονας αὐτοὺς ὠνόμασε· καὶ ἔν γε τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ φωνῇ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει τὸ ὄνομα· λέγει δὲ καλῶς καὶ ὅτι καὶ ἄλλοι ποιηταὶ πολλοὶ ὅσοι λέ-

"calls

" calls *Demons? Hermogenes* anſwers, I don't know.
" *Socr.* Nor don't you know that he ſaid, that
" the *firſt Generation of Men* was golden? *Herm.*
" I know this. *Socr.* He ſays of *this*, when this
" *Generation died*, theſe were called *Demons*, *chaſte*,
" *Earthly*, Good, *Drivers away of Evil*, the
" Guards of mortal Men. [*Herm.* What then?
" *Socr.* Why he calls it in my Opinion the *golden*
" Generation, not becauſe it was made of *Gold*,
" but becauſe it was *good:* My Reaſon for it is,
" that he calls ours the *Iron* Race. *Herm.* You
" ſay right. *Socr.* Don't you think therefore,
" if any of the preſent Race were *good*, he
" would not ſay they were of the *golden* Genera-
" tion? *Herm.* I think he would. *Socr.* But
" are the *Good* different from the *Wiſe* and *Pru-*
" *dent?* *Herm.* No. *Socr.* 'Tis thus therefore in
" my Thoughts he calls the *Demons*; becauſe they
" were *prudent* and *knowing* [δαήμονες] he calls
" them *Demons* [δαίμονες] and in our old Lan-
" guage, the Name agrees with this.] He therefore
" and many other Poets ſay *well*, who ſay that
" when any *good Man dies*, he obtains great Ho-
" nour, and becomes a *Demon*, according to the
" Meaning of the Word. And I agree to this;
" every wiſe Man, that is a good Man, *is* a *De-*
" *mon*, whether he is *alive* or *dead*, and is rightly
" *called* a *Demon.*" The next from the fifth Book *de Republica*, is on this wiſe, " [x] When any one

γεσιν, ὡς ἐπειδάν τις ἀγαθὸς ὢν τελευτήσῃ, μεγάλῃ μοίρᾳ καὶ τιμῇ ἔχει, καὶ γένει δαίμων, κατὰ τὸ τοῦ φρονήσεως ἐπωνυμίαν. ταύτῃ κἂν τίθεμαι κἀγὼ τὸν δαήμονα πάντ' ἄνδρα, ὃς ἂν ἀγαθὸς ᾖ, δαιμόνιον εἶναι, καὶ ζῶντα καὶ τελευτήσαντα, καὶ ὀρθῶς δαίμονα καλεῖσθαι. *Plato* in *Cratylo*, p. 52.

[x] Τῶν δὴ ἀπιθανόντων ἐπὶ τραγῳδίας, ὃς ἂν εὐδοκιμήσας τελευτήσῃ, ἆρ' ἂ πρῶτον μὲν φήσομεν εἶναι χρυσᾶ γένη ἦν; πάνυ γε μάλιστα· ἀλλ' ἂ πεισόμεθα Ησιόδῳ ἐπειδάν τινες εἶεν τοιάδε γένη τελευτήσωσιν, ὡς ἄρα

" having

" having behav'd himſelf well in War dies, ſhall " we not ſay that he belonged to the *golden Age?* " Certainly. And ſhall we not agree with *He-* " *ſiod*, that when any of that Age died, they " are *Demons*, pure, converſing with thoſe on " Earth, good, Diverters of Evil, Guardians of " Men? No doubt. If then we conſult [the] " God, how we ought to eſteem *Demons* and " Godlike Perſons, and what Honour ought to " be paid them, we ſhall eſteem them as he ap- " points. Why not? and hereafter will regard " and worſhip their *Sepulchres* as the Repoſitories " of *Demons*. The ſame alſo do we decree, when- " ever any one of thoſe who have been *excellently* " *good in Life*, dies either of old Age, or in any " other manner."

'Tis obvious to obſerve, upon both theſe Paſſages, that the Reaſoning is entirely founded upon thoſe Verſes of *Heſiod* explain'd above. The Philoſopher writes and argues upon the Hypotheſis of the Poet; firſt referring all good and wiſe Men, and all that behave well in War, to the *golden Age*, and then, as *Heſiod* calls the Men of that Generation *Demons*, inferring, that ſuch as theſe, may by parity of Reaſon be called ſo too; more particularly as to the *Cratylus*, where the Philoſopher is profeſſedly treating of Etymology, δαίμων is *quaſi* δαήμων, and ſignifies *wiſe*, which he looks upon to be the ſame as *good*,

Οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἁγνοὶ ἐπιχθόνιοι τελέθουσιν,
Ἐσθλοὶ, ἀλεξίκακοι φύλακες, μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

πεισόμεθα μὲν οὖν; διαπυθόμενοι ἄρα τοῦ θεοῦ πῶς χρὴ τοὺς δαιμονίους τε καὶ θείους τιθέναι, καὶ τίνι διαφόρῳ, οὕτω καὶ ταύτῃ θήσομεν ᾗ ἂν ἐξηγῆται; τι δὲ οὐ μέλλομεν· καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν δὴ χρόνον, ὡς δαιμόνων, οὕτω θεραπεύσομέν τε καὶ προσκυνήσομεν αὐτῶν τὰς θήκας· ταῦτα δὲ ταύτῃ νομιοῦμεν, ὅταν τις γήρᾳ ἢ τινι ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ τελευτήσῃ τῶν ὅσοι ἂν διαφερόντως ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἀγαθοὶ κριθῶσι. *Plato* de Republ. lib. v. p. 420.

whereupon

whereupon he thinks *Heſiod* did well in calling the good Men of the Golden Age *Demons*, *according to the Import of the Name, which conveys an Idea of Wiſdom* [y], and that according to the Meaning of the Word any good Man, *dead* or *alive*, might be called a *Demon*; his adding *alive*, plainly ſhews he only alludes here to the Etymon aſſigned. In the other Paſſage he is ſpeaking of the Encouragement proper for the Brave; he would have them rewarded in their Life time, and after their Death, and fetches Examples both from *Homer* and *Heſiod*; and when, according to the latter, he would have demoniacal Honours paid to them (as alſo to other Perſons eminently good) it is a mere political Encouragement of Bravery and Goodneſs, and not a Declaration of his own Opinion of the Nature of *Demons:* This muſt be ſought for elſewhere; and if you look into thoſe Dialogues where he induſtriouſly ſpeaks of the Order and Offices of thoſe Beings, you will find he was far from thinking them the *Souls of dead Men.* In the Apology [z], they are either *Gods*, or the *Sons of the Gods*; this was not only the Opinion of *Socrates*, but of his *Athenian* Judges too. In the *Timæus* [a], where he is purpoſely ſpeaking of the Nature of Things, though he declines giving his own Sentiments *of the Origin* of theſe Beings, *becauſe it was a matter too high and abſtruſe for him* [b], and therefore refers us to the *Sons of the Gods* who had ſpoken of ſuch Things, yet he regards them no otherwiſe than Gods, for *Oceanus* and *Tethys*, *Phorcys*, and *Chronus*, and *Rhea* are

[y] Καλὰ ἀπὸ τῆ φρονήσεως ἐπωνυμίαν.

[z] *Apolog.* pag. 21. Ed. *Cant.*

[a] *Timæus*, pag. 481. Ed. *Baſ.*

[b] Περὶ ὧν τὰ ἄλλων δαιμόνων εἰπεῖν καὶ γνῶναι τὰ γένεσιν, μεῖζον ἢ κατ' ἡμᾶς, ſays he.

there

there called *Demons*. You blame *Athenagoras* for quoting this Paſſage, "as a plain Evidence, that "*Plato* thought it above his Abilities to ſay any "thing of the Origin of *Demons*, or generated "Gods; for ſuppoſing he did not ſpeak in *this* "Place, has he not ſpoke ſufficiently in his *Cra-* "*tylus*, and in his Books of *Commonwealth* about "*Demons*[c]? By no means; he follows *Heſiod* in thoſe Places juſt as here he follows *the Sons of the Gods*; and from hence one ſees the Reaſon why in thoſe Paſſages he treads in the Steps of an ancient Author. *Plato* was very well appriz'd of the Exiſtence of this Claſs of Beings, and of the Rank they held in the Creation, and hath deliver'd his Opinion thereupon with all imaginable Clearneſs, but he refuſes to declare his own Sentiments as to the Origin of them[d]; and therefore I muſt think *Athenagoras*'s both a true and a judicious Obſervation. I proceed; in the [e] *Phædrus* he joins the *Demons* and the *Gods* together, and [f] *Macrobius* obſerves, though by Miſtake he quotes the Paſſage from *Timæus*, that *Gods* and *Demons* are there ſynonymous. In the *Politicus*[g], he calls the ſupreme Being μέγας δαίμων; he certainly thought he that made the World was more than *the Soul of a Man*. In the *Sympoſium*[h], we have

[c] Further Enquiry, p. 14.

[d] Περὶ ᾧ τ' ἄλλων δαιμόνων εἰπεῖν καὶ γνῶναι τ' γένεσιν, μεῖζον ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς are his Words.

[e] *Phædrus*, p. 202.

[f] *Macrob.* Saturn. l. i. c. 23. Nomen autem Dæmonum, cum Deorum appellatione conjungit; aut quia Dii ſunt δαήμονες, id eſt, ſcientes futuri; aut, ut Poſidonius ſcribit in libris quibus titulus eſt Περὶ Ἡρώων καὶ Δαιμόνων, quia ex ætherea ſubſtantia parta atque diviſa qualitas illis eſt.

[g] *Politicus*, p. 122. Ed. *Baſ.*

[h] *Sympoſium*. p. 187. Ὥσπερ τὰ πρότερα ἔφη, μεταξὺ θνητοῦ καὶ ἀθανάτου. Τί οὖν, ὦ Διότιμα; Δαίμων μέγας, ὦ Σώκρατες· καὶ γὰρ πᾶν

the

the Definition of a *Demon*; *Love, as was ſaid before*, ſays *Diotimas, is between a Mortal and an Immortal. What is he then, Diotimas? a great Demon, for every Being of that Sort is betwixt a God and a Mortal. What Office have they? That of interpreting and carrying Mens Prayers and Sacrifices to the Gods, and the Commands and Returns of theſe to them, &c.* They are deſcrib'd by *Plato*, as Mr. *Hutchinſon* obſerves [i], " as firſt employ'd " in the Creation of Men by Divine Appoint- " ment; and afterwards as guarding and conduct- " ing each Individual of the Race, from their " Entrance into the World, 'till their Departure " out of it." " Theſe Characters, as the ſame " learned Author remarks [k], are too ſublime to be " drawn for human Ghoſts;" theſe Employments are above the Reach and Execution of the Souls of Men, of whoſe *Immortality* this Philoſopher was but barely certain [l]. In ſhort, *Plato*'s Opinion concerning Demons is demonſtrably plain; it was the ſame as *Pythagoras*'s, whoſe Philoſophy he had deeply imbib'd; in the *Cratylus* he ranges the rational Beings in the ſelf ſame Order that *Pythagoras* does, *Gods, Demons, Heroes*, and *Men* [m]. *Philo* the *Jew* was a great Admirer and Follower of *Plato* and *Pythagoras* [n], and I think it very plain whom he meant when he ſaid, *whom the other* PHILOSOPHERS *call Demons*, MOSES *is wont to call* ANGELS [o]. I make no Queſtion but *Py-*

τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστι θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ· τίνα, ὦ δ' ἐγὼ, δύναμιν ἔχον; ἑρμηνεῦον καὶ διαπορθμεῦον θεοῖς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν· τῆ μὲν, τὰς δεήσεις καὶ θυσίας, τῆ δὲ, τὰς ἐπιτάξεις τε καὶ ἀμοιβὰς τῶν θυσιῶν, &c.

[i] Mr. *Hutchinſon*'s Sermon, p. 7. [k] Ibid. p. 8.

[l] *Apolog.* pag. ult. [m] *Cratylus*, p. 52.

[n] Vid. Ampliſſ. *Potterum* ad *Clem.* tom. i. p. 360.

[o] Οὓς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μωσῆς εἴωθεν ὀνομάζειν.

thagoras

thagoras and *Plato* were uppermoſt in his Thoughts: And I find *Theodoret* reporting *Plato*'s Demons to correſpond with the *Angels*: *Plato*, ſays he [p], *called thoſe* GODS *and* DEMONS, *whom we call* ANGELS, *and ſaid they were the Miniſters of the ſupreme Beings.* And ſo *Hierocles*, ſpeaking of *Plato*'s Theology [q]: *Of theſe the firſt rational Beings are call'd Celeſtial and Gods; the Beings of the Region next to this, he calls Ætherial and good Demons,* THE INTERPRETERS AND MESSENGERS OF GOOD THINGS TO MEN; *the human Race have the laſt Place, &c.* and ſo ſay all the *Platoniſts*, ſays Mr. *Mede* [r]. Some indeed have ſaid that *Plato* has the Word Ἄγγελος, or *Angel* in the Scriptural Senſe of the Word, as *Min. Felix c.* xxvi. and from him *Cyprianus de Idol. Vanit. p.* 206. ſee alſo *Tan. Faber*'s *Epiſt. lib.* i. *c.* 63. But I think the Paſſage of the Philoſopher quoted by *Faber* from the fourth Book of Laws does not come up to the Point [rr]. However, his Demons, in the Opinion of the *Greek* Writers above mention'd, were certainly tantamount to *Angels*, and ſprang from a traditional Doctrine of them. You may therefore, if you pleaſe, add *Plato* to the other ancient Philoſophers, who acknowledged a Rank of Beings equivalent

[p] Θεὺς ὁ καὶ δαίμονας κέκληκεν [Πλάτων] ὃς ἡμεῖς ἀγγέλους προσαγορεύομεν, καὶ τούτους γε λειτουργοὺς ἔφησεν εἶναι καὶ τοῦ ὅλων θεοῦ. *Theodoret.* Orat. iv. de Materia & Mundo.

[q] Ὧν, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα λογικὰ, θεότητά τε καὶ θεοὺς καλεῖσθαι· ἃ δὴ ἡ μετ' ἐκεῖνο ζύγημα ἔχειν ἔλαχε χώρα λογικὰ, αἰθέρια τε καὶ ἀγαθοὺς δαίμονας ὀνομάζῃ, τά τε συμφερόντων ἀνθρώποις ἑρμηνείας τε καὶ ἀγγέλους ἡγουμένους· τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπειον φῦλον τὴν τελευταίαν τάξιν ἐπέχειν, &c. *Hierocles* de Prov. & Fato, p. 240. Ed. *Needham*, & pag. 250.

[r] Mr. *Mede*'s Works, p. 627.

[rr] Διότι κυφῶν καὶ πλημμελῶν λόγων βαρυτάτη ζημία· πᾶσι γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος τοῖς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐτάχθη Δίκης Νέμεσις ἄγγελος. *Plato* de Legibus, lib. iv.

and ſimilar in many Reſpects to the *Angels*[s]; and if at any Time, he or any other old Author ſhould apply the Word *Demon* to *Men*, or *the Souls of Men*, you may be ſure it is always by a Figure, and never in the Strictneſs of the Letter, they never intending thereby to confound the Natural Difference ſubſiſting between theſe two Kinds of Beings: Such ſort of Expreſſions are very frequent in the Writings of the Ancients, both *Greeks* and *Romans*[t]; but they are always uſed by way of Compliment, or of Encouragement, or of Similitude, or *ex Hypotheſi*, or laſtly, in declaring hyperbolically, ſome great Advancement or Exaltation, ſuch as that of good Men in this Life, or after their Deaths. It would be highly abſurd to underſtand ſuch Paſſages literally; as likewiſe to

[s] Mr. *Hutchinſon*'s Sermon, p. 8.

[t] See Mr. *Hutchinſon*'s Sermon, p. 9. *Suiceri* Theſ. Eccleſ. tom. i. p. 1370. Edit. 1682. to whom I add the following Paſſages: *Homer* has his ἰσόθεος, θεοείκελος, and the like. *Heſiod* tells his Brother, if he were induſtrious, δαίμονι δ' οἷος ἔησθα, Ἔργ. & Ἡμερ. 314. So *Aur. Carm. Pythag.*

Ἔσσεαι ἀθάνατος θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκ ἔτι θνητὸς.

Empedocles ſays in *Laertius*, ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῖν θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκ ἔτι θνητὸς πωλεύωμαι. So *Juſt. Mart.* Orat. ad *Græc.* p. 145. ſpeaking of the Scriptures, ἥτις οὐ ποιητὰς ποιεῖ — ἀλλὰ παιδεύουσα, ποιεῖ τοὺς θνητοὺς ἀθανάτους, τοὺς βροτοὺς θεούς. *Theoph. Antioch.* l. ii. p. 134. of the firſt Man, ὅπως αὐξάνων καὶ τέλειος γενόμενος, ἔτι δὲ καὶ θεὸς ἀναδειχθεὶς, οὕτως καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβῇ. See alſo p. 142. *Clem. Alex.* Protrept. p. 88. οὐρανίῳ διδασκαλίᾳ θεοποιῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον. *Clemens* abounds with theſe Expreſſions, for which I refer you to the Annotation of the moſt excellent and moſt Reverend Editor. We have this proverbial Saying in *Zenobius* and *Suidas*, Ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπου δαιμόνιον; 'twas uſed when any one was unexpectedly preſerv'd by another, and was made happy by him. It is well known what great things the *Stoics* are wont to ſay of their wiſe Men; but I ſhall ſtop here, and content myſelf with ſending you, among the *Romans*, to *Cicero* de Orat. l. i. c. 23. l. ii. c. 42. and in Somn. *Scip. Hor.* Od. i. 1. *Virg.* Eclog. i. 6. iii. 104. *Juvenal* Sat. v. 132.

interpret

interpret *Plato* in the Places alledg'd, conſidering his Sentiments of *Demons* ſo plainly deducible from the other Parts of his Works any otherwiſe than *etymologically* as to the one, and *œconomically* as to the other; the firſt lies in a Work where Etymology is his Subject, and the other in that where he is forming a Commonwealth; *atqui in pleriſque Civitatibus intelligi poteſt*, AUGENDÆ VIRTUTIS GRATIA, *quo libentius Reipublicæ cauſſa periculum adiret optumus quiſque virorum fortium memoriam honore Deorum immortalium conſecratam. Cic. de Nat. Deor. l.* iii. *c.* 19.

And now, Sir, having gone through the ſeveral Allegations in Proof of your Point, *that the ancient Greeks meant by the Word* DEMON *in general, the Souls of departed Men*; I muſt leave it with you and the Reader to judge, whether, upon the matter, you have given the World that Satisfaction upon this Head, as might be reaſonably expected: Whether you have ſupported your novel Notion of this Word, in ſuch an unexceptionable manner, as to procure its Reception, in Oppoſition to the Senſe of all Antiquity: Whether your Obſervations and Arguments are ſo clear and cogent, as to induce an indifferent Perſon, or rather a Perſon us'd, and in ſome meaſure attach'd to a different Conception (for Mankind muſt be conſider'd in that Light upon this Occaſion) to relinquiſh an inveterate undoubted Opinion in Favour of yours: Whether, on the other hand, it be not a romantic impracticable Attempt, to fix any ſuch Meaning upon the Word in Queſtion. Your Readers in this Caſe, as may well be imagin'd, will require uncommon Evidence; and the rather, becauſe they cannot but obſerve, how demanding and diſtruſtful the Enquirer is, rigorouſly and

continually calling out for Argument and Proof, and admitting nothing but upon ſtricteſt Evidence.

But, good Sir, ſuppoſing you to have eſtabliſh'd your Poſition beyond all Doubt or Exception, *that the ancient Greeks meant by the Word* DEMON *in general, the* SOULS OF DEPARTED MEN, would it follow, that the ſame thing is intended by it in the Scriptures? I apprehend not. It is certainly poſſible it may have another Senſe in them, and ſhould this prove to be the Caſe, ſo much of your two Tracts, as relates to the claſſical Meaning of the Word, is nothing to the Purpoſe; this Point therefore is well worth your Attention; we will then ſecondly proceed to examine, with what Reaſon and Juſtice you apply the claſſical Senſe of the Word to the Scriptures.

Firſt then, it is poſſible this Word may carry a different Meaning in the ſacred Writings from what it did in the profane. It is a Rule amongſt the Critics, *that different Sects often uſed the ſame Words in expreſſing different Tenets*[v]. Now the Scriptures proceed upon a Syſtem of Theology quite different from the Mythology of the ancient Heathens, which is totally diſcarded therefrom; and therefore *a fortiori*, this Rule will be truer in Relation to them and the Religion of the idolatrous *Gentiles*, than of one Sect with another.

It is certain again, that there are many Words in the New Teſtament, which are uſed in a different Senſe from what they are in Claſſical *Greek*; I need not point out Inſtances to you, Sir; theſe new Acceptations make up one Branch of what is called *the Helleniſtic Greek*.

[v] *Le Clerc* Ars Critic. tom. i. p. 142. Edit. *Lond.*

And

And thus it comes to paſs, that the Compoſitions of the ancient *Greeks*, were they all now extant, are not the natural Interpreters of Holy Scripture, univerſally and in all Caſes. I am not for diſclaiming the uſe of human Learning on this Occaſion, any more than you are, being thoroughly ſenſible of the manifold Light that has been thrown upon the ſacred Text from thence in more than a thouſand Inſtances. In the Phraſeology, the Alluſions to ancient Cuſtoms, and the like, it is abſolutely neceſſary foreign Authors ſhould be conſulted, as where St. *Paul* alludes to the Games of *Greece*, and borrows Metaphors from them; but then where a different Hypotheſis is maintain'd, a different Syſtem of Theology, and quite different Things are ſpoken of, *there* the Words muſt obtain a new and a different Senſe: For as the HOLY GHOST in dictating the Language of Scripture, made uſe of a vulgar Tongue, and was conſequently contented with the Words thereof, it muſt needs be, that thoſe Words muſt in many Caſes, where new Things were delivered, receive new Notions and Ideas. Such Proceeding would not be attended with Obſcurity, becauſe the Hypotheſis or Syſtem, together with the Context, would always render them, as in all other good Writers, ſufficiently clear and intelligible. The Word Θεὸς in Scripture has not the ſame preciſe Idea affixed to it, as it has in Heathen Authors; the Λόγ@ of St. *John* is not the ſame with that of *Plato*; nor τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον the ſame as the *Sacer Spiritus* of *Seneca*[x]. Σωτὴρ is a Name ſometimes given to the Heathen Gods, but in a Senſe entirely different from that of the Holy Penmen, when they apply it to JESUS CHRIST.

[x] *Le Clerc* Ars Critic. tom. i. p. 142.

Διάβολ@

Διάβολος is a classical Word, but one never meets with it amongst the Ancients in that Sense it mostly has in Scripture, wherein κατ' ἐξοχὴν, and with the Article prefix'd, it denotes the *Devil*[y]. Ἄγγελος too is ascrib'd *novè* to the Angels in the Bible, by Way of Eminence. So *Plato*'s first Principles are these three, Θεὸς, Ὕλη, and Εἶδος, which may seem at first Sight to correspond perfectly with the Cosmogony of the Bible, *In the Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth*; *and the Earth was without Form, and void:* But upon a nearer View it will be found that *Plato*'s Ὕλη is very different from the Chaos of *Moses*; this was a Creature of God's Hand, but that was coæval with him. This may serve to shew, that it would be equally absurd to interpret the Scripture by the ancient Philosophy or Mythology, as to think of explaining these by that. In short, every thing has its proper Use, and whilst Recourse shall be justly had to the excellent Productions of the Ancients on some Occasions, it shall be very weak and impertinent to repair to them on others. The thing to be explain'd ought always to be carefully attended to; insomuch that some Thought and Judgment is requir'd in the Application of human Literature to the Oracles of God, and that both as to what Cases, and how far.

You are of Opinion, that the settling the Sense of the Word in Dispute, as found in the ancient *Greek* Writers, *is of Consequence* in this Controversy[z]; and in Pursuance of that Persuasion have thought fit to enquire into the Use and Acceptation of it amongst them, in the manner I am just

[y] *Reinesius* de Deo Endevellico, p. 377. Ed. *Crenii.*

[z] Further Enquiry, p. 2, 25.

now

now come from examining: But I doubt the Words Δαίμων and Δαιμόνιον will be found to be of that Sort, which it would be very improper and irrational to think of expounding by the Writings of thoſe who *are without*. They concern the Theology of the Bible, betwixt which and that of the ancient *Greeks*, whoſe Words they originally were, the Difference is infinitely wide; and it would be a perfect Wonder they ſhould retain the ſame Ideas in that which they had in this. In the one they were the Objects of divine Worſhip, but in the other they are not. In the one they denoted, as you contend, *the Souls of dead Men*, or as others ſay, *ſpiritual Subſtances ſuperior to Man*; but in the other, as is now and always was believ'd, they import *evil Spirits*. The Scripture Account is, that there ſubſiſts an intermediate Order of Creatures betwixt GOD and us, of which there are different Claſſes; that one of the firſt Rank, and a large Number of a lower Claſs, were ſometime before the Creation of this material World, turned out of Heaven for ſome Crime, and from thenceforward in the Hardneſs of their Hearts, have continually ſet themſelves againſt GOD and Goodneſs, and have brought unſpeakable Woe upon Mankind; the Ringleader of this wretched Crew is called the *Devil*, and the others *Demons*. This, Sir, is the generally receiv'd Opinion; but you, it ſeems, are pleas'd to make it a Queſtion whether the *evil Angels* of the Devil, are called *Demons* in Scripture, becauſe *Demon* ſignifies *a departed Soul*, in the ancient *Greek* Writers; but is not this very wild Reaſoning? Another might as well ſay, that *Demon* does not mean *a departed Soul* in *Homer*, for it ſignifies an *evil Spirit* in the Scriptures; or that it means an evil Spirit in *Heſiod*, becauſe it does ſo in the New Teſtament.

Teſtament. If the Ancients had been well acquainted with the Demonology of the Scriptures, and yet in writing upon it, or in alluding to it, had never given the Name of *Demons* to the *Devil's Angels*, but conſtantly had made uſe of ſome other, there would have been ſome Shew of Argument; but as matters ſtand, you muſt excuſe me, Sir, in thinking your Argumentation very defective here, and indeed that the whole of your Enquiry into the Meaning of the Word *Demon* amongſt the ancient *Greeks* altogether impertinent.

But you yourſelf at laſt ſeem ſenſible of this, for you have appeal'd upon *ſecond Thoughts* in the *Further Enquiry*, to the Scriptures upon this Head, aſſerting, "that in all the *Epiſtles*, the *Acts*, and "the *Revelations*, the Word Δαιμόνιον is uſed in "the ſame Senſe, as it was in the Heathen Wri-"ters, for *the Souls of departed Men*, and not for "*Devils*, or evil Spirits[a]." Here now you come to the Point; you do Buſineſs; and I freely join Iſſue with you, that if the Word in Queſtion conſtantly denotes *a departed Soul*, in the other Books of the New Teſtament, it ought in all Reaſon to do ſo in the Evangeliſts, that is in the Caſe of the *Demoniacs*.

The Courſe of this Examination may ſeem to require that it ſhould now be conſider'd, whether your Interpretation of the ſeveral Texts produc'd from the *Acts*, the *Epiſtles*, and *Revelations* will bear that Weight you are pleas'd to put upon them; but as the literal Interpretation is the defenſive Side of the Queſtion, I may be allow'd to offer ſomething in behalf of that, and then ſubjoin your Allegations, as Objections to it.

[a] Further Enquiry, *p.* 42.

I ſhall

I ſhall therefore now thirdly evince the true Scriptural Notion of the Words Δαίμων and Δαιμόνιον.

It is well known that the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts made uſe of the *Septuagint* Verſion of the Old Teſtament; for which Reaſon it will be proper previouſly to enquire in what Senſe the Seventy, together with the *Greek Jews* who uſed their Verſion, apply the Words. Theſe all followed the Bible Syſtem of Theology, and amongſt them conſequently we naturally ſeek for the Signification of theſe theological Terms. Now it will be found upon Examination, that with the Seventy, the Word Δαιμόνιον is always uſed in a bad Senſe [c]. It matters not in this Caſe what original Words the Interpreters render by Δαιμόνιον; they might not always act conſiſtently, tranſlating the ſame by the ſame; or they might not interpret faithfully every where; but they conſtantly mean evil Beings by that *Greek* Word; and that is enough. It appears that theſe Tranſlators had an Idea of *evil Angels* [c]; and what follows will ſhew you, that by thoſe evil Beings they call *Demons*, they meant *evil Spirits*, or *evil Angels*.

In the Tranſlation of the Book of *Tobit*, the Word Δαιμόνιον " is certainly uſed, as you confeſs " yourſelf, for an evil Spirit: And be the Book a " real Hiſtory or a Romance, it is certain Evi- " dence of the meaning of a Word at the Time " it was made;" but then to invalidate any Argument, that may be brought from the Diction of

[b] Deut. xxxii. 17. Ps. xcvi. 5. cvi. 37. xci. 6. Is. xxxiv. 14. xiii. 21. lxv. 11.

[c] Psal. lxxviii. 49. and Is. xxx. 4. and ſo the Vulgar in *Philo*'s Time talk'd of evil Angels. *Philo* de Gigant. p. 192.

this Apocryphal Book, you alledge, that "unleſs "we could tell when the Verſion was made, and "what was the original Word ſo render'd, little "uſe can be made of it on either Side of the pre-"ſent Debate." We need not be ſollicitous about the original Word, for let that be what it would, the Word Δαιμόνιον is there uſed for an *evil Spirit*: And as to the Age of it, though I do not pretend to fix the preciſe Time when the Book was tranſlated out of *Chaldee* into *Greek*, which is indeed uncertain, yet I will venture to ſay it was done *about the Time*, or rather, as I think, *before* the Incarnation of our Bleſſed Saviour; which is ſufficient for the preſent Purpoſe. It is quoted by *Polycarp*[d], and *Clemens Alexandrinus*[e], who both lived in the ſecond Century, and the former, being a Diſciple of St. *John*'s, flouriſhed at the Beginning of it. Conſidering this, you will hardly think I have put the Age of this Tranſlation too high. It was made then about the Time I ſpeak of, by ſome *Greek Jew* of *Alexandria*, *Palæſtine*, or *Antioch*, who all uſed the LXX Verſion, and is ſubſtantial Proof of the Senſe the Word Δαιμόνιον had then obtained, as likewiſe how it was then underſtood as lying in the LXX Verſion.

If you reflect upon the Time when the LXX Verſion was made, firſt of the *Pentateuch*, and then of the other Books of the Old Teſtament, and compare it with the Age of *Plato*, you will find the Tranſlators had Reaſon enough to give this Appellation to the rebellious Part of the firſt Order of created Beings. *Plato*'s *Demons* are *joint*

[d] Antiqua Verſio Epiſt. *Polycarpi*, p. 189. Ed. *Cotelerii*.
[e] *Clem. Alex.* tom. i. p. 503. tom. ii. p. 791.

Rulers

Rulers with the Great Demon[f], *the common Internuntii between Gods and Men*[g]. He employs them first in the Creation of Men by divine Appointment, and afterwards in guarding and conducting each Individual of the Race, from their Entrance into the World 'till their Departure out of it. And accordingly *Philo* the *Jewish Platonist* writes, if I may invert his Words, *Moses* is wont to call those *Angels*, which the *other Philosophers* call *Demons*[h]. The *Hellenistic Jews*, if you will permit me to call the LXX by that Name, saw at the same Time, that this was the Name that *Plato* and others of the Ancients gave to their Gods, or at least to a secondary Class of them, whom they for their Parts could not but regard as evil Beings, on every Account; but especially for that they had so impudently usurped and monopolized the Worship of the one true God: More than this, they saw this Name actually given by the Heathens themselves to evil Beings; and therefore it was a proper Appellation whereby to distinguish

[f] Οἱ συνάρχοντες τῷ μεγίστῳ δαίμονι θεοί. *Plato* in *Politico*, p. 122.

[g] Ἑρμηνεύοντες καὶ διαπορθμεύοντες θεοῖς τὰ παρ' ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ θεῶν. *Plato* in *Sympos.* p. 187.

[h] Οὓς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μωσῆς εἴωθεν ὀνομάζειν. *Philo* de Gigantibus; and whereas *Philo* afterwards says, ψυχὰς οὖν δαίμονας, καὶ ἀγγέλους, ὀνόματα μὲν διαφέροντα, ἓν δὲ ταὐτὸν ὑποκείμενον διανοηθεὶς, ἄχθος βαρύτατον ἀποθήσῃ δεισιδαιμονίαν, it is evident that ψυχὴ here is not to be restrain'd to the *human Soul*, for how could *Philo* think that was the same with the Ἄγγελοι of *Moses*? but means an immaterial Substance in general. See before pag. 23, 24. So he writes above, Οὓς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μωσῆς εἴωθεν ὀνομάζειν. ψυχαὶ δ' εἰσὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα πετόμεναι. And thus he reckons the *good Angels* to be Souls, τῶν οὖν ψυχῶν, οἱ μὲν πρὸς σώματα κατέβησαν, αἳ δ' οὐδενὶ τῶν γῆς μορίων ἠξίωσάν ποτε συνενεχθῆναι. ταύταις ἀφιερωθείσαις καὶ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς θεραπείας περιεχομέναις ὑπηρέτισι καὶ διακόνοις ὁ δημιουργὸς εἴωθε χρῆσθαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν θνητῶν ἐπίστασιν. *Philo* de Gigantibus, p. 192.

in their Theology, thoſe malignant Spirits, who had ſwerved from their Allegiance along with the Arch-Fiend, from thoſe upright Beings of the ſame Rank, who ſtill perſiſted in their Obedience and Service to the Lord of All; and accordingly they ſo apply'd it: Inſomuch as that Inſinuation of yours[i], that the Demons of the ancient *Greeks* were all originally *good Beings*, were it never ſo true, would have ſtood you in no ſtead, for nothing is more uſual than for Words to come from an *indifferent* to a *bad* Senſe; or, if you will, from a *good* one to a bad one[k].

That this was the Senſe the LXX and the other *Helleniſts* had put upon this Word, is further evident, from its having the like uſe amongſt the Holy Penmen of the New Teſtament, who ſtill went upon the Syſtem of the Bible, and made uſe of the Scriptural Language of the Time, *viz.* that which is called, though perhaps improperly, *the Helleniſtic Greek.*

I think all competent Judges agree in the Similitude of Style and Diction in the Writers of the New Teſtament, and the *Greek* Tranſlators of the Old. Our Countryman, the late Mr. *Blackwall*, propos'd to give us "A Diſſertation upon the "LXX, and the Advantages of ſtudying it, in "order to have a better Notion of the Senſe and "Taſte of the Beauties of the *Greek* Teſtament[l]." *Hugh Broughton*, another of our Countrymen, had compoſed a Lexicon out of the LXX, for the better underſtanding the New Teſtament[m]; it was given to *Sion* College, but does not appear in that Library now, having been loſt, as I am in-

[i] See before, p. 17. [k] Mr. *Hutchinſon*'s Sermon, p. 14.
[l] *Blackwall*'s Sacred Claſſics, vol. i. p. 81. Ed. 4to.
[m] *Joh. Chriſtoph. Wolfii* Not. in *Caſauboniana*, p. 204.

form'd

ſorm'd by Mr. *Reading*, in the Fire of *London*. M. *George Raphelius*, a learned Foreigner, who by diligently comparing the Style of the New Teſtament with that of *Polybius*, *Arrian*[n], and *Xenophon*[o], has elucidated the ſacred Text in innumerable Inſtances, was yet of Opinion that the Style of it might be collated to better Purpoſe with the Septuagint, and had formed a Deſign of that Sort[p]; which, whether it is yet carried into Execution or not, I cannot tell. To him I might joyn *Lambert Bos*[q], *Johannes Alberti*[r], and ſix hundred more, who in illuſtrating the Diction of the New Teſtament from profane Authors, have nethleſs Recourſe continually to the LXX; but I ſhall content myſelf with the reporting the Judgment of the incomparable *Joh. Alb. Fabricius*, in whoſe Death the Republic of Learning has lately ſuſtained an almoſt irretrievable Loſs. This admirable *Grecian* delivers himſelf thus[s]: *The* HEBRAISMS *which occur in the New Teſtament, grew partly from the uſe of the* LXX *Verſion, and partly*

[n] *Hamburgi*, 1715. [o] *Hamburgi*, 1720.

[p] Præf. ad Annotationes ex *Arriano* & *Polybio*. & p. 36. ejuſdem Operis.

[q] Exercitationes Philologicæ.

[r] Obſervationes Philologicæ.

[s] Hebraiſmi vero qui in libris N. T. obvii ſunt, partim ab uſu verſionis LXX Interpretum, partim a ſcribentium conſuetudinum profluxere, qui Hebræo-Chaldaico generi loquendi adſueti, etiam cum Græce ſcriberent, ducebant aliquem idiomatis illius colorem. *Et paulo poſt:* Qui porro novum veluti linguæ genus effinxerunt viri doctiſſimi quod vocarunt Helleniſticum, nimium dixêre illi quidem & minus commode uſi ſunt vocabulo: quocunque tamen nomine appelles, certum eſt ſingularem quendam & ab aliis ſcriptoribus Græcis differentem non linguam nec dialectum, ſed colorem dictionis Græcæ Stylique in libris N. Fœderis extare, cui nihil uſquam ſimilius aut propius eo nomine accedens reperitur, quam Græca LXX Interpretum verſio Veteris Teſtamenti. *Fabric.* Bibl. Græc. tom. iii. p. 224.

from

from the Turn of the Writers, who being accuſtomed to the HEBRÆO-CHALDAIC *Manner of ſpeaking, could not help drawing ſome Strokes of that Idiom, even when they were writing Greek.* And preſently after: *Thoſe learned Men who deviſed a new kind of Language, which they called* HELLENISTIC, *carried the matter too far, and uſed an improper Word: But by whatever Name you pleaſe to call it, it is certain, there is a peculiar, not Language, or Dialect, but Strain of Style and Diction in the Greek Teſtament, different from other Greek Writers; Nothing is ſo like it, or comes nearer to it than the* LXX *Verſion.*

As to this particular Caſe, I deſire you would compare 1 COR. x. 20. with DEUT. xxxii. 17. St. *Paul*'s Words are ἀλλ' ὅτι ἃ θύει τὰ ἔθνη, δαιμονίοις θύει, καὶ οὐ θεῷ· and in *Deuteronomy* it is written, ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις, καὶ οὐ θεῷ; and likewiſe attend to the following Obſervations, which I hope may convince you, that the New Teſtament Writers always put the Words in the Senſe I contend for.

MATTH. ix. 34. xii. 24. MARK iii. 22. LUK. xi. 15.

Beelzebub is called *the Prince of the Devils*[t]; that is, he is called *a Demon*; and the *Demons* in virtue of this Expreſſion, were of the ſame Nature with him. When *Agamemnon* is called King of Men, it ſignifies to us, that he was one of the ſame Species. But the thing follows plainly from the Argumentation of our Bleſſed Saviour, *Every Kingdom divided againſt itſelf is brought to Deſolation: and every City or Houſe divided againſt itſelf ſhall not ſtand: and if Satan caſt out Satan, he is divided*

[t] Ὁ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων.

againſt

againſt himſelf; *how ſhall then his Kingdom ſtand?* MATTH. xii. 25, 26. The Subjects of a Kingdom, the Citizens of a City, and the Domeſtics of a Family, are all of the ſame Nature with their reſpective Heads or Governors; it runs, *if Satan caſt out Satan, he is divided againſt himſelf*; this is the Application of the other ſhort Parables; and here both *Beelzebub* and the *Demons* are called *Satan*, and conſequently they were all Devils. I obſerve that the Fathers of the Church do accordingly ſtyle the Devil, a *Demon*[v].

Before I proceed to another Text, I would here take Notice, that your Obſervation, "that the "Goſpels conſtantly put a Difference betwixt ὁ "Διάβολος and Δαίμων, and never confound the "Words, the Devil and Demon[x]" is of no manner of uſe to you; for the Anſwer to the Queſtion you there put, "whence ſhould this "happen, if the ſacred Writers did not make a "Difference betwixt Demons, and Devils, or e-"vil Spirits" is very obvious. The Scriptures do make a Difference between thoſe Words, but it is no more than that which ſubſiſts between a Prince and his Subjects, who both partake of one common Nature, but the Prince, as preſiding over the reſt, has a peculiar Name of his own: To the Prince the Scriptures give the Name of ὁ Διάβολος, and to the Subjects that of *Demons*, and in *them* they are not convertible Terms both Ways; but ſtill the Devil is, and may be called a *Demon*, juſt as a Prince is, and may be called *a Man*. In after Ages it came to be otherwiſe, and the *Demons* were called *Devils*, as they are at this Day

[v] *Juſt. Mart.* Cohort. ad Græc. p. 87. *Theoph. Antioch.* lib. ii. p. 146. *Tertullian* Apolog. c. 22.

[x] Preface to Further Enquiry.

in

in our Language, the Uſe and Cuſtom of which has given this Appellation to *Demons*; even tho' it is certainly derived ultimately from the *Greek* Word Διάβολος[y]; for which Reaſon I ſee no harm in rendering Δαίμονες or Δαιμόνια by *Devils*, ſo long as it is underſtood that by *Demons* are meant *evil Spirits* or *Angels of the Devil*; though it may not ſtrictly anſwer the Terms of the Original. But at the ſame Time I would not pertinaciouſly contend with you or any Man who ſhould chuſe to read *Demons* in our Verſion rather than Devils; the Alteration would be of no Conſequence in this Diſpute either Way.

LUKE xiii. 11.—16.

11. *And behold, there was a Woman, which had a Spirit of Infirmity eighteen Years, and was bowed together, and could in no wiſe lift up herſelf.* ——
16. *And ought not this Woman being a Daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo theſe eighteen Years, be looſed from this Bond on the Sabbath Day?*

The Woman whoſe Caſe is here recorded, had a Spirit of Infirmity eighteen Years, and was bound by *Satan* ſo long. You think this was no *Demoniacal* Caſe[z], but if it was not ſuch, it was a *Diabolical* one; the Woman was bound by *Satan*, by the Devil himſelf[a]. Whereupon I form the Argument, that the *Demons* who are repreſented in the New Teſtament as bringing Diſeaſes upon People, were of a *Diabolical* Nature, that is, were Agents or Angels of the Devil. I obſerve what you have upon this Caſe, *Enquiry*, *p.* 54. where

[y] *Reineſius* de Deo Endovellico, p. 377. Ed. *Crenii.*
[z] Enquiry, p. 54. [a] Ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς.

you

you ſay, " A *Spirit of Infirmity* is nothing but an " *infirm Diſpoſition*, or *Habit*, in the *Jewiſh* Phraſe- " ology ; — and as to the other Expreſſion — *Sa-* " *tan hath bound her* — that Word would have " been uſed whatever was the true Cauſe of this " Indiſpoſition — *Satan* is nothing elſe but *Ad-* " *verſary*, and is to be underſtood according to " the Subject to which it is apply'd ;" and then you give ſome Inſtances where it is uſed in that lax Senſe. I anſwer, the Word Σαλανᾶς, with the Article prefix'd, always ſignifies the *Devil* in the New Teſtament, and that you neither have, nor can produce one Inſtance to the contrary.

ACTS x. 38.

The *Devil* is here expreſly ſaid to do, what the *Demons*, that is, his Angels did ; juſt as a King or Prince in Authors is made to do, what his Soldiers or Miniſters, or any other of his Agents tranſact for him. St. *Peter* tells *Cornelius* and his Company, that they knew *How God had anointed* JESUS *of* NAZARETH *with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Power ; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppreſſed of the Devil : For God was with him.* The Words, *healing all that were oppreſſed of the Devil*, allude to a viſible Fact in the Life of *Jeſus Chriſt* ; the Apoſtle appeals to ſomething notoriouſly apparent, that was ſeen or known as well by theſe *Gentiles*, as by the *Jews*, and that was the Expulſion of *Demons* ; and whereas it is added, *for God was with him*, it is as much as to ſay, his Cures of that Sort were all done by the Power of GOD ; juſt as our Bleſſed Saviour aſſerts MATTH. xii. that what he did in ejecting *Demons* was by the Finger of GOD, and not thro' *Beelzebub* the Prince of the *Demons* ; and ſo *Origen*

underſtands this Text[a]. From hence then I gather that the *Demons* of the Evangeliſts were all evil Angels of the Devil. And whereas it is aſſerted by you, " that the Scriptures uſe the Word " *Demoniacs*, [I ſuppoſe you mean Δαιμονιζόμενοι] " but never expreſly attribute this Diſorder to the " Devil or his Angels[b]; " the Poſſeſſions in general, are here aſcribed to the *Devil*, as being all effected by his Inſtruments and Agents, that is his Angels; and you will pleaſe to remember, that the Diſorder of the Woman who had the Spirit of Infirmity eighteen Years, is attributed, as we have juſt now ſeen, to the *Devil*, who brought a Diſeaſe likewiſe upon holy *Job*. As to that looſe and general way of interpreting this Paſſage of the " Recovery of Man from the Power and Dominion " of the Devil to Obedience to GOD," which you ground upon the Expreſſion καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ Διαβόλου, which you ſay, " never implies *Poſ-* " *ſeſſion* from *Demons*, or any any thing like it[c]: " *This* was no viſible Caſe, that St. *Peter* ſhould appeal to that; beſides, the poſſeſſed Patients were very notably held in Subjection or Vaſſalage to the Devil; and the Paſſage may very well be thought to allude to PSAL. cxlvi. 7, 8. *Which executeth Judgment for the Oppreſſed, which giveth Food to the Hungry, the Lord looſeth the Priſoners, the Lord openeth the Eyes of the Blind, the Lord raiſeth them that are bowed down*; which may be compar'd with JOH. ix. 32. and LUKE xiii. 16. The Expreſſions of St. *Luke* there, who is ſpeaking of the Woman that had the Spirit of Infirmity eighteen Years, is very remarkable and appoſite to the Point in

[a] *Origen* contra *Celſ.* l. viii. p. 420.
[b] Further Enquiry, p. 53. and Pref. to Further Enquiry.
[c] Further Enquiry, p. 60.

hand

hand, *And ought not this Woman, being a Daughter of* ABRAHAM, *whom* SATAN *hath* BOUND, *lo theſe eighteen Years, be* LOOSED *from this* BOND *on the Sabbath Day?* But methinks the Word *healing*, ἰώμενος, may help to aſcertain the Meaning of this Text; it makes it not only correſpond the more perfectly with LUKE xiii. but alſo reſtrains it to bodily Diſeaſes; it is a Word frequently uſed by the Evangeliſts on the Occaſion; St. *Peter* indeed has apply'd it otherwiſe in a more general Way to the Salvation of Mankind by CHRIST, *by whoſe Strypes*, ſays he, *ye were healed*, 2 PET. ii. 24. But this is an elliptical Locution, the entire Senſe being, *by whoſe Strypes ye are healed of your Infirmities*. You ſay, "the Deſign of St. *Peter* has "nothing to do with *bodily Cures*, or ſuch little "Conſiderations." Not with the curing of *mere bodily Diſeaſes*, I grant you, but the curing of Perſons corporally poſſeſſed by evil Angels of the Devil it has. This is no little Conſideration; it is a Fact, and a Fact of the utmoſt Importance, as it ſhew'd *Cornelius* and the whole World, by a plain and ſenſible Effect, that our Bleſſed Saviour was inveſted with a Power ſuperior to all the Powers of Darkneſs, and was the Perſon, who was to recover Man from the Dominion and Vaſſalage of the Devil. There is no manner of Occaſion for you to depart from the Letter, to obtain the Senſe you ſtrike out; but if to get the Senſe, you exclude the Letter, you immediately ſtrip St. *Peter*'s Addreſs to *Cornelius* of its Proof, and thereby render it vague, unſatisfactory, and dogmatical.

1 COR. x. 20, 21.

20. *But I ſay that the things which the Gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice unto Devils and not to God: and I would not that ye ſhould have Fellowſhip with Devils.*

21. *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils; ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils.*

Devils or *Demons* here are the Gods of the Nations, and are oppoſed to the true GOD throughout, juſt as in the LXX Verſion, DEUT. xxxii. 17. PSAL. xcvi. 5. ſee alſo PSAL. cvi. 37. from whence it neceſſarily follows, that *Demons* here mean evil Spirits or Angels of the Devil; theſe were the *Gods of this World*, by which Phraſe St. *Paul* characterizes the Devil, 2 COR. iv. 4.

1 TIM. iv. 1.

Now the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly, that in the latter Times ſome ſhall depart from the Faith, giving heed to ſeducing Spirits and Doctrines of Devils.

Doctrines of Devils, are the Suggeſtions of evil Spirits, or of the Angels of the Devil, that grand Seducer, who by himſelf, or his Agents, *deceiveth the whole World*[d]; for not only the Δαιμονιάρχης himſelf was buſied in deluding the Sons of Men, but his Angels the Demons too, as St. *Paul* teſtifies, *Put on the whole Armour of God, that ye may be able to ſtand againſt the Wiles of the Devil; for we wreſtle not againſt Fleſh and Blood, but againſt Principalities, againſt Powers, againſt the Rulers of*

[d] REV. xii. 9.

the

the Darkneſs of this World, againſt ſpiritual Wickedneſs in high Places[e]. The Devil is called before the *Prince of the Power of the Air*[f], and theſe were the Subjects that conſtituted his Kingdom. What was before urged from the Expreſſion, *the Prince of the Devils*, MATTH. ix. 34, *&c.* receives much Strength from theſe Texts, for as the Partiſans and Subjects of the Arch Fiend are in the Evangeliſts ſtyled *Demons*, and in the Epiſtles *Principalities* and *Powers*, it evidently follows that they were one and the ſame, and conſequently, that the Demons had Power over Mankind, and were not departed Souls.

This Comment is greatly confirm'd by 1 TIM. v. 15. *For ſome are already turned aſide after Satan.* For turning aſide after *Satan*, is the ſame thing as *departing from the Faith by giving heed to ſeducing Spirits and Doctrines of Devils*; from whence the Relation between *Satan* and the *Demons* appears, and that following the one, is all one with following the other. This is exactly a parallel Caſe with ACTS x. 38. where the *Devil* is aſſerted to be the Author of All the Poſſeſſions effected by the *Demons*; and St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* very notably explain one another.

JAMES ii. 19.

Thou believeſt that there is one God, thou doſt well; the Devils alſo believe and tremble.

The Senſe is, if thou *only believeſt*, and doſt not bring forth *the Fruits of Faith*, thou doſt no more than what the *Devil* and his *Angels* do, who believe and tremble.

[e] 2 EPHES. vi. 11, 12. [f] Chap. ii. 2.

JAMES iii. 15.

This Wiſdom deſcendeth not from above, but is earthly, ſenſual, deviliſh.

The Apoſtle is ſpeaking of Envying and Strife, which he ſays are *deviliſh*; it muſt be more than ψυχικὴ in the Climax; and indeed Strife and Envy are the ſpecifical Attributes of the Devil. See *Grotius* and *Whitby*.

REV. ix. 20.

And the reſt of the Men that were not killed by theſe Plagues, yet repented not of the Works of their Hands, that they ſhould not worſhip Devils, and Idols of Gold, and Silver, and Braſs, and Stone, and of Wood; which neither can ſee, nor hear, nor walk.

To whatever Times this Paſſage relates, the Turn of the Expreſſion is manifeſtly that which is always uſed in ſpeaking of the Pagan Idolatry; and the Letter certainly refers to that. So DAN. v. 4. *They drunk Wine, and praiſed the Gods of Gold, and of Silver, of Braſs, of Iron, of Wood, and of Stone.* And Inſenſibility is in like manner objected to the Heathen Idols by the Royal Pſalmiſt. See PSAL. CXV. 3, *ſeq.* CXXXV. 15. *Devils* here are therefore the ſame as in 1 COR. X. 20. namely the Gods of the Heathen.

REV. XVI. 13, 14.

And I ſaw three unclean Spirits like Frogs come out of the Mouth of the Dragon, and out of the Mouth of the Beaſt, and out of the Mouth of the falſe Prophet: For they are the Spirits of Devils, working Miracles, which go forth unto the Kings of the Earth, &c.

Devils

Devils here muſt neceſſarily mean *evil Spirits* ſuperior to the Souls of Men; for the Souls of Men never have the Power of working Miracles attributed to them in Holy Scripture. *Secondly*, The *Devil* has Miracles and Wonders aſcribed to him in the ſacred Code, therefore theſe *Demons* muſt be of a like Nature, and have a like Power with him. *Thirdly*, Whereas the characteriſtic Appellation, *unclean Spirits*, the ſame which is perpetually given by the Evangeliſts to their *Demons*, is here us'd of theſe *Demons*, who beyond all doubt were evil Spirits or Angels of the Devil, it follows that *thoſe* were likewiſe his Angels. *Fourthly*, This Text abſolutely determines the Senſe of the Word *Demon* in the former Place, *c.* ix. ℣ 20. let that Paſſage relate to what it will.

To theſe particular Texts, I now add all the Hiſtories and Paſſages that relate to *Demoniacs* in the Evangeliſts; of which the obvious and conſiſtent Meaning is, that they were Perſons actually poſſeſſed by *evil Spirits* originally more than human. You yourſelf do not pretend, but that the ſeveral Caſes and Texts are naturally and intelligibly explain'd in that Way of Interpretation, and are ſufficiently reconcileable and conſonant one with another.

But that this is the true and proper Senſe of the Words in Queſtion throughout the whole New Teſtament, the Fathers of the Church moſt clearly evince, repreſenting the Demons unanimouſly in their Writings, as ſpiritual Subſiſtencies, evil, and ſuperior to the Souls of Men. I don't find you much diſpute the Senſe which the ancient Fathers put upon this Word, but you ſeem however not duly to have conſider'd the Weight they have in this Controverſy.

The

The Fathers write upon the Syſtem of the New Teſtament, and are the natural Interpreters thereof: To them we muſt have the ſame Recourſe, for the right underſtanding the Theology of the Bible, as we have to *Ovid* and *Apollodorus*, in expounding the ancient Mythology of the Pagans; and their Judgment and Teſtimonies are cited with more Pertinence and Propriety, more Force and Concluſiveneſs, than that of *Proclus* or the Scholiaſt of *Homer* is appeal'd to by you in interpreting *Heſiod*[g]. They liv'd not long after the Apoſtles; the Language of the New Teſtament and of the LXX Verſion, was the Mother Tongue of many of them, and where it was not, yet as it was in their Days a living Language, they had a thorough Knowledge of it, as appears from their Writings. They were acquainted with the Acceptation of the Words in Queſtion, *before* as well as *after* the Goſpel Times, and that both in ſacred and profane Authors, and yet unanimouſly, not one or two, but one and all agree, in putting the Senſe I contend for upon them. They had perus'd *Homer*, *Heſiod*, *Plato*, and all the beſt and moſt authentic Mythologiſts, were Men of eminent Parts and Learning; and conſidering the Number of them, and the Conſonancy of their Sentiments upon this Head, the Fathers, as Interpreters of Scripture in this Caſe, have Advantages above what all the extant Scholiaſts and Mythologers together can have in Matters relating to their Superſtition: For beſides thoſe above mention'd, the Silence of the old Enemies of Chriſtianity, who were *Greeks* as well as the Fathers, and muſt be allow'd to have underſtood well their own Language, eſpecially the Claſſical *Greek*, of

[g] Enquiry, p. 3.

which

which *Julian* was a great Maſter, comes in to corroborate very ſignally the Evidence given by the Fathers. Neither *Celſus*, *Porphyry*, or *Julian* ever except to the Senſe in which the *Chriſtians* uſed the Word *Demon*, though theſe always meant by it evil Beings more excellent in their Nature than the Souls of Men. *Julian* allows our Bleſſed Saviour to have ejected Demons, without ever arraigning the *Chriſtian* Senſe of the Word [h]; and *Celſus* in ſpeaking of the Demons always admits them to be of the Nature of *Angels* [i], but being God's Creatures, contends they ought to be worſhipped [k]: *Porphyry* ſpeaks freely of *evil Demons* and their Illuſions, both in the Fragments of that Treatiſe of Philoſophy he compil'd from the *Ancient Oracles* preſerv'd by *Euſebius*, as likewiſe in his Books of *Abſtinence*.

You imagine it was from that Text, *Thou believeſt that there is one God, thou doſt well; the Devils alſo believe and tremble*, Jam. ii. 19. "That "the Fathers ſaid thoſe things concerning Devils "which occur ſo frequently in their Writings [l]." If it was ſo, that Text alone is ſufficient to uphold them in their Interpretation; for no Argument can be plainer or ſtronger in the Eye of any impartial Judge. But why muſt the Fathers be thought to have taken up their Notion from that Text only? They put the ſame Senſe upon all the Texts relating to *Demons* or *Demoniacs*, which they have Occaſion to handle: In ſhort, it might be from *that* along with the reſt, but I am certain it was not from that excluſive of the others: for when *Juſtin Martyr* ſays, *the Gods of the Hea-*

[h] *Julian* apud *Cyrill. Alex.* lib. vi. p. 191. & 213.
[i] See the Places cited, p. 11.
[k] *Celſ.* apud *Orig.* lib. vii. p. 376. & lib. viii. p. 394, 400.
[l] Further Enquiry, p. 47.

then are Demons[m], he had his Thoughts upon PSAL. xcvi. 5. *As for all the Gods of the Heathen they are but Idols*, as is evident both from the ſameneſs of the Words, and from hence that the Paſſage of the *Pſalmiſt* is quoted immediately before; and before, *p.* 310. you will find him arguing the Apoſtacy of ſome of the Angels very expreſly from this Text amongſt others; he does not allege there one ſingle Paſſage from the New Teſtament, but collects the thing entirely from the Old: And *Origen* produces that Text in Proof of the ſame Thing[n], as you yourſelf allow[o].

You think ſome of the Fathers agree with you, in that Obſervation, "that the ancient *Greeks* "meant by the Word *Demon* in general, the *Souls* "*of departed Men*," and you cite *Tertullian* and *Juſtin Martyr*[p]: Now if it were ſo, this would not ſerve your Purpoſe, for you cannot reaſon from the Notion of the ancient *Greeks*, to that of the inſpired Penmen; theſe very Fathers, admitting they concurred with you as to the Claſſical Senſe of the Word, are conſentient with the reſt of their venerable Brethren in underſtanding the Word, as it lyes in the Bible, of *evil Spirits*, a Degree higher than the Souls of Men. But the worſt is, the Paſſages you produce from theſe great Authors, are racked by you to a Senſe they never thought of. As they both wrote upon the *Chriſtian* Scheme, and accordingly always uſe the Word *Demon* in other Places for evil Spirits, it is incredible upon the Face of the Aſſertion, they ſhould any where ſay, the Souls of ſuch as had once liv'd upon Earth

[m] Δαιμόνιά εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ τ̃ ἐθνῶν. Dialog. cum *Tryph.* p. 318. Ed. *Thirlb.* the Words of the *Pſalmiſt* are, πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τ̃ ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια.

[n] *Origen* contra *Celſ.* l. vii. p. 378.

[o] Further Enquiry, p. 27. [p] Enquiry, p. 3, 4.

were

were *Demons:* The Light theſe great Doctors of the Church had drawn from Scripture, eaſily let them into the true Nature and Origin of Pagan Idolatry, namely, that the Devil was the firſt Author of it[q], and that the Affair was afterwards carried on by him and his accurſed Inſtruments[r]. Theſe were Points which the Heathen themſelves were always totally ignorant of, but yet without recurring to theſe wicked inviſible Agents, we ſhould be at a Loſs for an adequate Cauſe of the palpable Stupidity of the ancient Idolaters. When therefore *Juſtin Martyr* writes, *the Gods of the Heathen are Demons*[s]; and *Tertullian*, *you think thoſe are Gods whom we know to be Demons*[t]; it cannot be thought they meant to tell us, the Gods of the Heathen were *departed Souls*; they entertained different Notions of them, eſteeming them to be evil Spirits, whoſe proper Names, according to *Juſtin Martyr*, were *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *&c.* or who, according to *Tertullian*, procur'd themſelves to be worſhipped under thoſe Names. But they ſhall ſpeak for themſelves; the former, as was ſaid, thought *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *Neptune*, *&c.* were the proper Names of the *Demons: Heretofore theſe* IMPURE DEMONS *under various Apparitions went in unto the Daughters of Men, and defiled Boys, and dreſs'd up ſuch Scenes of Horror, that ſuch as entered not into the Reaſons of Things, but judg'd by Appearance only, ſtood aghaſt, and never imagining them to be evil Demons, call'd them* GODS, *and invoked them by ſuch*

q *Juſt. Mart.* Cohort. ad Græc. p. 87, 88, 173. *Theoph. Ant.* lib. ii. p. 144. *Cyril. Alex.* contra *Julian*, lib. iii. p. 91.

r *Juſt. Mart.* Cohort. p. 128. & Apolog. prima paſſim.

s Δαιμόνιά εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, Dialog. cum *Tryph.* p. 318. Enquiry, p. 4.

t Ipſi putatis eos eſſe Deos quos nos Dæmonas ſcimus. *Tertull.* ad *Scapulam.* Enquiry, p. 3.

Names as they had given to themselves[v]. *Justin* calls the Devil himself a *Demon*, whom he scarce thought *a departed Soul*[x]; and he distinguishes the *Demons* from all such Souls, in most direct Terms[y]: *When he shall raise from the Dead all the Men that ever had a Being, and shall invest the Righteous with Bodies incorruptible, and make the Ungodly*, TOGETHER WITH THESE EVIL DEMONS, *feel his Vengeance in everlasting Fire.* *Tertullian*, whose Opinion was that *these impure Spirits* served themselves by means of the Heathen Gods, whom they caused to be worshipped for that Reason, writes thus: *By a Contagion that walketh in the like Darkness, do Demons and evil Angels blast the Minds of Men, agitating them with Fury and extravagant Uncleaness, and outrageous Lusts mixed with various Errors, the most capital of which Errors is, that having taken Possession of Mens Minds, and secur'd them on every Side from the Power of Truth, they recommend to them the Worship of false Gods, that by the Nidours of those Sacrifices they might procure a Banquet for themselves, the Stench of the Flesh and the Fumes of the Blood being their proper Repast*[z]. In consequence of

[v] Ἐπεὶ τὸ παλαιὸν δαίμονες φαῦλοι, ἐπιφανείας ποιησάμενοι, καὶ γυναῖκας ἐμοίχευσαν, καὶ παῖδας διέφθειραν, καὶ φόβητρα ἀνθρώποις ἔδειξαν, ὡς καταπλαγῆναι οἱ λόγοι τὰς γενομένας πράξεις οὐκ ἔκρινον, ἀλλὰ δέει (μυηρπασμένοι, καὶ μὴ ἐπισάμενοι δαίμονας εἶναι) φαύλους, θεοὺς προσωνόμαζον, καὶ ὀνόματι ἕκαστον προσηγόρευον, ὅπερ ἕκαστος αὐτῷ τῶν δαιμόνων ἐτίθετο. *Just. Mart.* Apol. i. p. 10. Ed. *Thirlb.* See also p. 13, 33. and Apol. ii. p. 114.

[x] *Just. Mart.* Cohort. p. 87. Ed. *Oxon.* See also Mr. *Twells's* Answer to the Enquiry, p. 12.

[y] Ὅ τε καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀνεγερεῖ, πάντων τῶν γενομένων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀξίων ἐνδύσῃ ἀφθαρσίαν, τῶν δ' ἀδίκων ἐν αἰσθήσει αἰωνίᾳ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΦΑΥΛΩΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΩΝ εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον πῦρ πέμψει. *Just. Mart.* Apolog. i. p. 76.

[z] Eadem igitur obscuritate contagionis aspiratio Dæmonum & Angelorum mentis quoque corruptelas agit furoribus & amentiis fœdis, ac sævis libidinibus cum erroribus variis, quo-

this

this Opinion you will find *Tertullian* conſtantly aſſerting that *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *Venus*, and the reſt, were but mere Men and Women[a]; juſt as *Athenagoras*, *Clemens*, *Lactantius*, *Arnobius*, and others of the Fathers do, who yet all held that the Gods of the Heathen were *unclean Spirits*. *Tertullian* held that all Souls went into *Hades*, and affirms that the *Demons* took pains to oppoſe that Opinion: *Nay, if I be not miſtaken*[b], *we diſcover the Fallacy of an evil Spirit, when it lurks under the Maſk of dead Men, by Experience; while he ſometimes under our Exorciſms, affirms himſelf to have been a Man, and one of our Progenitors ſometimes to have been a Gladiator — as being concern'd for nothing more than this, that he may contradict what we preach; and it may not be eaſily believed, that all Souls go into Hades*; and this in *order to* DISTURB MENS FAITH ABOUT THE DAY OF JUDGMENT, *and* ABOUT THE RESURRECTION. *Yet will this Dæmon, after he hath tried to delude the Company, be ſo far over-ruled by the Preſence of the Divine Grace, as unwillingly to confeſs himſelf to be what he really is.*

They both agree they were *Demons* or *evil Spirits* ſuperior to the Souls of Men, whom the Ancients worſhipped under the Names of *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *&c.* though they vary ſomewhat as to the

rum iſte potiſſimus, quos Deos iſtos captis & circumſcriptis hominum mentibus commendat, ut & ſibi pabula propria nidoris & ſanguinis procuret ſimulachris & imaginibus oblata. *Tertull.* Apolog. c. xxii. See alſo c. xxi. ad finem. c. xxiii. c. xxvii. initio.

[a] *Tertull.* Apolog. c. x, xi, xxviii, xxix.

[b] *Tertull.* de Anima, c. lvii. Hanc quoque fallaciam ſpiritûs nequam ſub perſonis defunctorum delitiſcentis, niſi fallor, etiam rebus probamus; quum in Exorciſmis interdum aliquem ſe ex parentibus hominem ſuis affirmat, interdum gladiatorem — nihil magis curans, quam hoc excludere quod prædicamus, ne facile credamus animas univerſas ad inferos redigi, &c.

manner

manner how; that is, they had learned from the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament[d], that the Gods of the Heathen were *impure Spirits*, but theſe not informing them at the ſame Time of the *manner of it*, as to that they were left to themſelves. *Tertullian*'s Opinion was generally follow'd.

It is evident then, that when *Juſtin* ſays, *the Gods of the Heathen are* DEMONS; and *Tertullian*, *You think thoſe are Gods, whom we know to be* DEMONS, they intended to call them *impure Spirits* of a Rank above human; thus neither of them could mean they were only the *Souls of dead Men*. You therefore entirely miſtake *Juſtin Martyr* in that Paſſage you bring from the firſt *Apology*, to prove that he calls *Demons the Souls of the deceas'd*[d]. The good Father is there going to prove to the Heathen, that Souls live after the Death of the Body, and are capable of Puniſhment; his Words are[e]: *But ſince all departed Souls continue in Senſation, and everlaſting Fire is treaſured up for the Unrighteous, let me adviſe you to look well about you, and lay theſe Things ſeriouſly to Heart; for even Necromancy, and the Inſpection of the Entrails of ſound Children, and*

[c] PSAL. xcvi. 5. 1 COR. x. 20. compar'd with 2 COR. iv. 4. ACTS xxvi. 18,

[d] Enquiry, p. 4.

[e] Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ καὶ αἴσθησις πᾶσι γενομένοις μένει, καὶ κόλασις αἰωνία ἀπίκειται, μὴ ἀμελήσατε πεισθῆναί τε καὶ πιστεῦσαι ὅτι ἀληθῆ ταῦτα ἐστι; Νεκυομαντεῖαι μὲν γὰρ, καὶ αἱ διαφθόρων παίδων ἐποπτεύσεις, καὶ ψυχῶν ἀνθρωπίνων κλήσεις, καὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι παρὰ τοῖς Μάγοις ὀνειροπομποὶ καὶ πάρεδροι, καὶ τὰ γινόμενα ὑπὸ τῶν ταῦτα εἰδότων, πεισάτωσαν ΥΜΑΣ, ὅτι καὶ μετὰ θάνατον ἐν αἰσθήσει εἰσὶν αἱ ψυχαί. καὶ οἱ ψυχαῖς ἀπιθανόντων λαμβανόμενοι καὶ ῥιπτούμενοι ἄνθρωποι, (οὓς δαιμονιολήπτους καὶ μαινομένους καλοῦσι πάντες) καὶ τὰ παρ' ΥΜΙΝ λεγόμενα Μαντεῖα Αμφιλόχου, καὶ Δωδώνης, καὶ Πυθοῦς, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτά ἐστι, καὶ τὰ τῶν Συγγραφέων διδάγματα, Εμπεδοκλέους καὶ Πυθαγόρου, Πλάτωνός τε καὶ Σωκράτους, καὶ ὁ παρ' Ομήρῳ βόθρος, καὶ ἡ κάθοδος Οδυσσέως εἰς τὴν τούτων ἐπίσκεψιν, καὶ τῶν τὰ αὐτὰ τούτοις εἰπόντων. *Juſt. Mart.* Apolog. i. p. 27. Ed. *Thirlb.*

 the

the calling out the Souls of dead Men, and what the Magicians term Dream-Senders and Familiars, and many other Practices of the Dealers in this black Art, may induce YOU *to believe that Souls after Death are in a State of Senſation; and moreover thoſe Perſons who are ſeiz'd and thrown down by the Souls of the deceas'd, and who are call'd by all* DEMONIACS *and mad, and likewiſe thoſe* YOU *call the* AMPHILOCHIAN, DODONÆAN, PYTHIAN, *and other like Oracles; and alſo the Doctrines of many of your Writers, ſuch as* EMPEDOCLES, PYTHAGORAS, PLATO, *and* SOCRATES, *and* HOMER's *Ditch, and* ULYSSES's *Viſit to the Infernal Shades, and others that ſay the ſame.* — Can any thing be plainer than that he is here arguing with the *Gentiles* from their own Practices and Perſuaſions? And that therefore it was a Belief of theirs, and not of *Juſtin*'s, that *Perſons were ſeiz'd and thrown down by the Souls of the deceas'd?* For the *Gentiles* believ'd at this Time, as you yourſelf muſt allow, that the Souls of the deceas'd had Power over the Bodies of the Living. The Words, *who are called by* ALL, that is, all the *Gentiles*, *Demoniacs and mad*, are a Parentheſis, and were added to ſhew, that by their Expreſſion on the Occaſion, they nevertheleſs owned, that *real Demons* or *impure Spirits* did it. His Argument from the Word or Expreſſion, is juſt ſuch a one as *Lactantius* uſes, when he taxes *Apollo* with calling himſelf an *impure Spirit*, becauſe he calls himſelf a *Demon* in his Oracles[f]; and as that of *Min. Felix*, who contends that the *Gentiles* acknowledged the Unity of the Godhead, from the Phraſes ſo common in their Mouths, *God is great, God is true, if God permits*[g]. Many ſuch like Argu-

[f] *Lactant.* lib. i. c. 17.

[g] *Min. Felix* c. xviii. and *Tertull.* Apolog. c. xvii.

ments

ments occur in the Writings of the Fathers, and even in *Juſtin Martyr* himſelf. *Cohort. p.* 109, 905. *Apolog.* i. *p.* 82. and indeed the Caſt and Manner of the former Part of the firſt *Apology*, is almoſt entirely an Argument *ad homines*.

I tranſlate the Word Δαιμονιολήπτους, *Demoniacs*, as Mr. *Twells* and Mr. *Reeves* have done before me; and by *Demoniacs* I mean Perſons vexed by Maladies induc'd by *Demons*. As the Author is not here delivering his own, but the Sentiments of the *Gentiles*, to whom his Piece is directed, it is not indeed material to the Point, whether the Word ſignifies ſuch ſort of Perſons, as the old *Vates* who were under an Alienation of Mind, raging, and foaming, and full of the God; but I mention the thing, becauſe I obſerve, that tho' you was once of the ſame Opinion with us, *Enquiry*, p. 4. 40. yet, forgetting what you had there written, you inſiſt ſtrenuouſly upon the latter Interpretation in the *Further Enquiry*, p. 49. and I remit you, for my Reaſons, to Mr. *Twells*'s Anſwer to the *Further Enquiry*, p. 11.

But ſay you, "Why is the Change of Expreſſion made, ſo as to ſay, *all call* thoſe that are "ſeized by the Souls of deceaſed, *Demoniacs* or "*Madmen*, but *you call* the Oracles of *Dodona*, "*&c?* Why was it not *you call* in the former In"ſtance, as well as in the latter; if that were *Ju*"*ſtin*'s Sentiment, that *only* the *Heathen* underſtood "by Demons the Souls of departed Men, whilſt "he himſelf underſtood ſomething elſe by that "Word[h]." Nothing is more common than the Change of Perſon in Authors of the beſt Note; but I ſhall content myſelf with one Example, which ſhall be from *Juſtin* himſelf, *Whom therefore*

[h] Further Enquiry, p. 50.

ſay

ſay ye, O Grecians[i], *are the Maſters and Teachers of your Religion? the Poets? You had better never ſay it to Men that are acquainted with the Writings of the Poets; for* THEY *know that moſt ridiculous Theogony of theirs, as it is call'd, which* WE *learn from the Poems of* HOMER, *your firſt and chief Poet.*

You miſrepreſent *Tertullian* too, when quoting the following Paſſage from him[k], *They inflict upon Mens Bodies Diſeaſes; and are the peculiar Authors of ſome Sorts of very grievous Miſchances; but as to the Soul, they are the Authors of Mens going ſuddenly and extraordinarily beſides themſelves: The Subtlety and Fineneſs of their make*[l], *&c.* you apply it to the *Demons* of the ancient *Greeks* upon your Hypotheſis, that is, to *departed Souls*; for *Tertullian* is there ſpeaking of *his Demons*, which were entirely different from *yours.*

But *Juſtin Martyr* and *Tertullian* are not the only Authors amongſt the Fathers, whom, by endeavouring to intereſt them in your Cauſe, you have miſrepreſented. In the *Further Enquiry*, p. 20. you hook in *Origen*; after declaring there who the old Gods of the Heathen were, and adding a Word or two of evil Demons, you proceed thus: 'As 'this was the ancient Scheme of the Origin of 'Demons, it may be worth while to obſerve how 'Origen has accounted for them. "It is a common "receiv'd Opinion not only amongſt *Chriſtians* "and *Jews*, but amongſt many others, both *Greeks*

[i] *Juſt. Mart.* Cohort. p. 43.

[k] Enquiry, p. 11.

[l] Corporibus quidem & valetudines infligunt, & aliquos caſus acerbos; animæ vero repentinos & extraordinarios per vim exceſſus: ſuppetit illis ad utramque ſubſtantiam hominis adeundam ſubtilitas & tenuitas ſua; multum ſpiritalibus viribus licet ut inviſibiles & inſenſibiles in effectu potius quam in actu ſuo appareant. *Tertull.* Apolog. c. xxii.

" and *Barbarians*, that the *humane Soul* ſubſiſts af-
" ter its Departure from the Body; and it is rea-
" ſonable to believe that the *pure Soul*, not borne
" down by the heavy Weight of Sin, is carried
" up on high to the Places of purer and etherial
" Bodies, having left here below groſs Bodies,
" and the Pollutions that belong to them: But
" the *wicked Soul* is attracted downwards by its
" Sins towards the Earth; and, not able to aſpire
" upwards, is borne hitherward, and toſſed up and
" down: Some of theſe live about Sepulchres,
" where one may ſee the Apparitions of *ſhadowy*
" *Souls*; others of them are flying about the Earth:
" What Sort of Spirits ought one to think them
" to be, which are tied down whole Ages, as one
" may ſay, to certain Houſes or Places, either by
" Charms or by their own Malice? Reaſon tells
" us, that they ought to be taken for *evil Spirits*,
" who uſe Prophecy, a thing of an indifferent
" Nature in itſelf, to deceive Men, and to draw
" them from God and pure Religion," This was
' in *Origen*'s Time a *commonly receiv'd Opinion*[m].'
One would think by this Account that it was a

[m] Ἀλλὰ καὶ εἴπερ πεπίστευται οὐ παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς καὶ Ἰουδαίοις μόνοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις πολλοῖς Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων, ὅτι ζῇ καὶ ὑπάρχει μετὰ τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος χωρισμὸν ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη ψυχή· καὶ τῷ λόγῳ παρίσταται, ὅτι ἡ μὲν καθαρὰ, καὶ μὴ βαρουμένη ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς κακίας μολίβδων, μετέωρος φέρεται ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους τῶν καθαρωτέρων καὶ αἰθερίων σωμάτων, καταλιποῦσα τὰ τῇδε παχέα σώματα καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς μιάσματα· ἡ δὲ φαύλη, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτάδων καθελκομένη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ μηδ' ἀναπνεῦσαι δυναμένη, τῇδε φέρεται καὶ κυλινδεῖται, ἡ μέν τις ἐπὶ τὰ μνήματα, ἔνθα καὶ ὤφθη σκιοειδῶν ψυχῶν φαντάσματα, ἡ δέ τις ἁπαξαπλῶς περὶ τὴν γῆν· ποδαπὰ χρὴ νομίζειν εἶναι πνεύματα, τὰ ὅλου (ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω) αἰῶνας προσδεθέντα, ὥσπερ εἴτε μαγγανείαις τισιν, εἴτε διὰ τὴν σφετέραν κακίαν, οἰκοδομαῖς καὶ τόποις; ὁ λόγος δὴ αἱρεῖ φαῦλ' ἄττα νομίζειν εἶναι τὰ τοιαῦτα τῇ προγνωστικῇ δυνάμει, μέσῃ τυγκανούσῃ, εἰς ἀπάτην ἀνθρώπων χρώμενα, καὶ πρὸς τὸ περισπάσαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τῆς καθαρᾶς εἰς αὐτὸν σεβείας. *Orig.* contra *Celſ.* lib. vii. p. 334.

common receiv'd Opinion in *Origen*'s Time both amongſt *Chriſtians* and *Jews*, that Demons were only the *departed Souls of wicked Men*; but it happens very unfortunately for you, that your Author expreſly diſtinguiſhes thoſe impure Spirits *the Demons*, *from* ſuch Souls. He is here ſpeaking of the prophetic *Afflatus* in the *Pythian* Oracle, which he ſays proceeded from an *evil Demon*; and after one Argument diſpatch'd from the manner of Inſpiration, he goes on, *Moreover ſince it is commonly believ'd that Souls exiſt after Death*; *and it is reaſonable to think that wicked Souls are borne down to the Earth and live about Sepulchres*; *what manner of Spirits muſt we imagine them to be which are tied down whole Ages to certain Places? evil no doubt?* The Argument proceeds thus; if ſuch Souls as hover about the Earth are *impure* and *wicked*, the Spirit that gives the Oracle, and is tied down whole Ages to the ſame Place, muſt be ſo. The Souls of Men he calls ψυχαὶ, and theſe Spirits πνεύματα, and what he ſays about the State and Condition of the *Souls*, is the *Medium* from whence he argues *a fortiori*, to *impure Spirits*; which therefore muſt be different from them: And indeed, *Origen never* confounds theſe two ſpiritual Beings, but is every where perfectly conſiſtent both with himſelf and the other Fathers, as to the Nature and Rank of the Demons, namely that they were of an higher Order than the Souls of Men. Thus then the *commonly receiv'd Opinion*, *Origen* ſpeaks of, has nothing to do with the latter Part of the Paragraph, but is reſtrained to the general Poſition, that the *human Soul* ſubſiſts after its Departure from the Body, which was indeed an univerſal Doctrine; but as to any thing further, it was far from being currently thought either by *Origen* himſelf, or by *Chriſtians*,

Jews, *Greeks*, or *Barbarians*, that *Demons* were *mere departed Souls*.

It remains with me an inconteſtable Truth, that the *Demons* of the Fathers were univerſally and in all Caſes, an Order of *Spirits* originally ſuperior to the Souls of Men; wherefore in my poor Judgment there will be no manner of Occaſion for you to explain to us in a ſeparate Work, what the firſt *Chriſtians* meant by their *Demoniacs*[n]; you may ſpare yourſelf that Trouble. You alledge, indeed, that what the Fathers have concerning the manner of Operation of theſe *impure Spirits* in the Heathen World, their ſuggeſting idolatrous Practices reſiding in the Images of the Pagan Deities, perſonating them, and drawing all Adoration to themſelves, is mere Hypotheſis wanting Proof[o]. But what the Fathers have deliver'd upon this Subject muſt be good as to their own Opinions; and does with the utmoſt certainty inform us what they intend, when they tax the Gods of the Heathen with being *Demons*, and likewiſe what *their Demons* were. We are here enquiring what *they* meant by Demons, and it appears upon every Suppoſition, whether the *Demons* uſurped the Names of the Heathen Gods, or *Jupiter*, *Apollo*, *&c.* were their own true proper Names; or whether the Fathers were right in imagining they reſided in the Images of the Heathen Deities, and delighted in Steams, Odours, and Libations, or not; that they ever regarded them as *impure Spirits*, ſuperior to Man. The Truth of this Caſe has been already ſtated, where it was obſerv'd, that the Notion the Fathers had of the *Demons* was drawn from Scripture, tho' as to the manner of their Operations amongſt the *Gentiles* they were left to themſelves.

[n] Preface to Enquiry. [o] Further Enquiry, p. 25, 27.

To

To the inſpired Writers of the Books of the New Teſtament, and their beſt Interpreters, the Fathers, I now add the *Jewiſh* Writer *Joſephus*, who follow'd the Bible Syſtem of Theology, and made uſe of the LXX Verſion. I find him not only uſing the Word *Demon* in a bad Senſe, but alſo for *evil Spirits* originally more than human. *God enabled Solomon*, ſays he, *to learn the* ANTI-DEMONIAC ART, *for the Benefit and Health of Mankind; he both compoſed Incantations whereby Diſeaſes were alleviated, and alſo left thoſe Forms of Exorciſm, by which the Demons being bound, are ſo expell'd as never to return*[p]. And again: *For Beings that are called* DEMONS *(theſe are the Spirits that poſſeſs wicked Men)* ENTERING *into living People, and killing ſuch as have no Help, this Herb preſently drives them away, though it be only brought to ſuch as are ſick*[q]. But in this laſt Paſſage you think he calls the *Souls of wicked Men*, *Demons*; for you render it, *theſe are the Souls of wicked Men*[r]. But as the Author ſhews he underſtood the *Demons entered* the Bodies of Men, and brought Diſeaſes upon them, I would aſk you whether the *Jews* conceiv'd that the *Souls of dead Men* had a Power of entering and vexing the Bodies of the Living? Whether *Joſephus* ever uſes πνεῦμα for the *Soul of a Man*, and not always ψυχὴ[s]? And how it comes

[p] Παρέιχε δ' αὐτῷ [Σολομῶνι] μαθεῖν ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τῆ κατὰ τῶν δαιμόνων τέχνην εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ θεραπείαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἐπῳδὰς τε ξυνθεῖναι αἷς παρηγορεῖται τὰ νοσήματα, καὶ τρόπους ἐξορκώσεων καταλειπεν, οἷς ἐνδέδεμα τὰ δαιμόνια ὡς μηκέτ' ἐπανελθεῖν ἐκδιώκουσι. *Joſeph.* Antiq. l. viii. c. 2. § 5.

[q] Τὰ δὲ καλούμενα δαιμόνια, (ταῦτα δ' πνεύματα πονηρῶν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπων πνεύματα, τοῖς ζῶσιν εἰσδυόμενα καὶ κτείνοντα, τοὺς βοηθείας μὴ τυγχάνοντας, αὕτη ταχέως ἐξελαύνει, κἂν προσενεχθῇ μόνον τοῖς κάμνουσι, *Joſeph.* de Bello *Jud.* l. vii. c. 6 § 3.

[r] Enquiry, p. 5. Further Enquiry, p. 25, 52.

[s] Mr. *Twells*'s Anſwer to the Enquiry, p. 6.

to

to paſs, that he ſhould ſo contradict a principal Tenet of his own Sect, the *Phariſees*, who held that wicked Souls were kept in everlaſting Impriſonment under the Earth[t]? 'Till ample Solutions can be given to theſe Queſtions, we are bound to interpret this Place thus, *theſe are the Spirits that poſſeſs wicked Men.* And, indeed, it appears plain enough, that the Senſe *Joſephus* puts upon the Word *Demon*, is the very ſame with that in the New Teſtament, namely, *evil Spirit*; for he calls *that* Δαιμόνιον[v], which the LXX Verſion calls πνεῦμα πονηρὸν[x]; Terms which are ſynonymous and reciprocal in the New Teſtament; whereupon I affirm, that *Joſephus*'s Demons were *evil Spirits* originally more excellent than us.

The Authors of the LXX Verſion, the *Helleniſts* and *Jews* that made uſe of it, the inſpired Authors of the Books of the New Teſtament, and the Fathers of the Church all follow the ſame Syſtem of Theology, and they all harmoniouſly agree in uſing the Word *Demon* for an *evil Spirit.* They all prove one another, as the Cauſe and the Effect; and as to the New Teſtament, the Argument runs, *if the Word* DEMON *denoted an Evil Spirit amongſt the* HELLENISTIC JEWS, it does ſo in the New Teſtament; an Argument much more concluſive than that of yours, DEMON *ſignifies a departed Soul amongſt the ancient* GREEKS, *therefore it means the ſame in the New Teſtament*; becauſe, as has been ſhewn, the New Teſtament Writers made uſe only of the Words of one, but both the Theology and the Ideas, as well as the Words of the other.

[t] Mr. *Twells*'s Anſwer to the Enquiry, p. 7.
[v] *Joſeph.* Antiq. lib. vi. c. 10, 13, 14.
[x] 1 KINGS xvi. 14, 16.

Let

Let us now examine your Scripture Arguments, *viz.* the Objections you ſtart againſt this univerſally receiv'd Notion of theſe controverted Words; and whether they are of Force ſufficient to break through this Chain of Argument. The Texts produc'd are ACTS xvii. 18. 1 COR. x. 20, 21. 1 TIM. iv. 1. REV. ix. 20. JAMES ii. 19.

ACTS xvii. 18.

Upon this Text your Comment is, "When "St. *Paul* was at *Athens*, certain of the *Epicureans* "and *Stoics* attacked and charged him with being "Ξένων δαιμονίων καταγελᾶς, *a Setter forth of ſtrange* "DEMONS *or Gods:* now he preached unto them "*Jeſus*, and that GOD had *raiſed him from the* "*dead*, ℣ 31. and therefore the Word *Demon* here "is uſed for the Soul of one deceaſed, or of a "Man *raiſed from the dead*[y]." The Words of St. *Luke* are, *Other ſome, he ſeemeth to be a Setter forth of ſtrange Gods: becauſe he preached unto them Jeſus and* THE RESURRECTION; that is, the Reſurrection of Mankind in general, as appears from ℣ 31, 32. *He hath appointed a Day in the which he will judge* THE WORLD *in Righteouſneſs, by that Man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given Aſſurance unto all Men, in that he hath raiſed him from the dead. And when they heard of* THE RESURRECTION *from the dead, ſome mocked, &c.* See alſo chap. iv. 2. But be this as it will, whoſe Words are theſe, and out of whoſe Mouths do they come? The *Epicureans* and *Stoics*, ſay you; then, ſay I, this Text is nothing to the Purpoſe; for it is not the Notion of the ancient Heathen you are here ſeeking after, but that which St. *Luke* had of the Word *Demon*. — You would be hard

[y] Further Enquiry, p. 42.

put

put to it to prove that the *Demons* of thoſe Philoſophers were departed Souls; *Celſus* the *Epicurean* never applies the Word in that Senſe[z], and Mr. *Mede* ſhall be my Voucher for the *Stoics*[a]. In ſhort, the moſt you can make of this Text, is *ſtrange Gods* in the Heathen Notion, who were far from thinking their Deities the Souls of mere dead Men, as has been amply argued above; but if they did, it would ſignify nothing in this Caſe.

1 Cor. x. 20, 21.

20. *Thoſe things which the Gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice to Demons and not to God: and I would not that ye ſhould have Fellowſhip with Demons.*

21. *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Demons; ye cannot be Partakers of the Table of the Lord, and of the Table of Demons.*

You will agree that the *Demons* here are the Heathen Gods, the Deities to whom the *Gentiles* ſacrificed. How then does this Text ſerve you? You are about to prove that *Demon* in the *Acts*, the *Epiſtles*, and *Revelations* means a departed Soul, and you cite theſe Words where the Gods of the Heathen are called *Demons*. But does not the Queſtion ſtill recur, whether the ancient *Greeks* regarded their Deities as *departed Souls?* And then whether, ſuppoſing they did, the ſame preciſe Meaning is affixed to the Word in the Scriptures as is in them? You muſt give us further Satisfaction on both theſe Heads before we ſhall part with this Text to you: It appears to us as yet, that when the Scriptures ſay the Gods of the Heathen were *Demons*, they mean to call them *evil Spirits* of a Rank above departed Souls. But you lay Streſs

[z] See before, p. 11. [a] *Mede's* Works, p. 627.

on

on St. *Paul's* ſaying, *that an Idol is nothing*; for you write, "The Apoſtle had a little before ob-"ſerv'd, chap. viii. 4, 5, 6. *That an* IDOL *is no-*"*thing in the World*; *and that there is no* OTHER "GOD *but one. For though there be that are* CAL-"LED GODS, *whether in Heaven or in Earth, as* "*there be Gods many and Lords many, yet to us there* "*is but one* GOD *the Father — and the Lord* JESUS "CHRIST. *Demons* therefore were called Θεοὶ, "*Gods* and *Lords*; and to partake of the Sacrifi-"ces offered to them, was to be in *Friendſhip* with "them. To eat therefore at *Venus*'s Table, the "principal Goddeſs of *Corinth*, was to own her "as having Dominion over them: Not to own a "*Devil* to have ſuch Power, which would be own-"ing a Truth, if evil Spirits have ſuch Power o-"ver us; but owning *Venus* to have a Power, "which ſhe has not.[b]." St. *Paul* is there ſpeak-ing of eating Things offered unto Idols, and he ſays; *We*, the Diſciples and Followers of *Jeſus Chriſt*, *know*, *that an Idol is nothing in the World*; that is, *no proper Object of divine Worſhip*, *no God*, *for there is no other God but one*; juſt as GAL. iv. 8. he ſays, *then when ye knew not God*, *ye did Service unto them* WHICH BY NATURE ARE NO GODS. This is the natural Interpretation of this Text, and is ſuch an one as you cannot except againſt, for if the Idols or Gods of the Heathen were departed Souls, according to your Scheme they ſtill were *ſomething*; and you are obliged to underſtand the Apoſtle, when he admits an Idol to be Nothing, 1 COR. x. 19. as if he had ſaid, *it is no true God*; for you make him ſay, "I agree[c] that "an Idol is nothing; but remember that thoſe "things which the *Gentiles* ſacrifice, they ſacrifice

[b] Further Enquiry, p. 44. [c] *Ibid.* p. 43.

" to what they think to be ſomething: They do " it to *Venus*, *Apollo*, and a thouſand other Be- " ings, whom they look upon as Gods, and who " are properly *Demons*;" that is, whom they look upon as true Gods, but are not ſo.

1 TIM. iv. 1.

Now the Spirit ſpeaketh expreſly, that in the latter Times ſome ſhall depart from the Faith, giving heed to ſeducing Spirits and Doctrines of Demons.

You chuſe to adhere to the Interpretation Mr. *Mede* has given us of this Text; who underſtands it as containing a Prophecy fulfilled in the worſhipping of Saints now practiſed in the Church of *Rome*; by *Doctrines of Demons* being meant *Doctrines concerning Demons*. This great Author, it muſt be confeſſed, has ſupported his Opinion with great Learning and much Ingenuity, but I cannot be of your Opinion that he has brought the Point to Demonſtration[d]; for, as Dr. *Whitby* obſerves, to whom I refer you as my Advocate, this Paſſage muſt relate to the Apoſtolic Age; for at ℣ 6. the Apoſtle exhorts *Timothy to put the Brethren in Remembrance of theſe Things*, which could not be, if it was a Prediction relating to After-Times. In the next Chap. ℣ 15. he ſays, *Some are already turned aſide after Satan*; and ſee 2 TIM. iv. 3, 4. Theſe *ſeducing Spirits* were therefore *Spirits of Error*, 1 JOH. iv. 6, and the *Doctrines of Demons* the Suggeſtions of thoſe evil Spirits.

[d] Further Enquiry, p. 46.

REV.

REV. ix. 20.

And the reſt of the Men that were not killed by theſe Plagues, yet repented not of the Works of their Hands, that they ſhould not worſhip DEVILS, Δαιμόνια, *and Idols of Gold, and Silver, and Braſs, and Stone, and of Wood; which neither can ſee, nor hear, nor walk.*

Hereupon you write, "Look[e] for the Comple-
"tion of this Prophecy in the *Weſtern* World, in
"*Italy*, and the Parts adjacent.—— Did ever any
"one charge the *Chriſtian* World with the Wor-
"ſhip of *Devils?* or where are any *evil Spirits*,
"made the Objects of Adoration amongſt the Fol-
"lowers of *Jeſus? Demons*, indeed, in the true
"and native Senſe of the Word, have been, and
"are worſhipped to this Day; but why the Charge
"of worſhipping the *Devil*, deteſtably corrupt as
"ſome Part of the Chriſtian Church is, ſhould be
"ſaid, I know not."

You take it for granted that this Prophecy concerns the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, particularly in the Article of Saint-Worſhip; but *Grotius* and *Hammond* interpret it of the Heathen Idolatry, and refer it to the *Jews* and their Aſſociates before the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*. I think it very plain, let the Paſſage relate to what it will, that the Terms belong to the ancient Idolatry, ſee above, *p.* 54. and by the common Rule of Interpretation, the Word Δαιμόνιον muſt here mean, what it does in the other Places, where it is us'd of the Heathen Idols. It is not unuſual for Prophecies to carry a double Meaning, one *preſently*, and another more *remotely* fulfilled, or if you

[e] Farther Enquiry, p. 46.

will, for the Words and Expreſſions of Prophets to admit a twofold Interpretation. Suppoſing then the Words ſhould ultimately reſpect the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, this will not hinder, but *Demons* here may be *evil Spirits*, conſiſtently with the other Scriptures; but if the Scriptural Senſe of that Word be *evil Spirits*, as has been largely and clearly prov'd, theſe *Demons* muſt be evil Spirits, for the Apoſtle muſt needs uſe, let him be ſpeaking of what he will, the Scriptural Language of the Time. But what if the Idolatry of the Church of *Rome* ſhould be a worſhipping of *evil Spirits*? You aſk indeed, "Did ever any one charge the "*Chriſtian* World with the Worſhip of *Devils*? "or where are any evil Spirits made the Objects "of Adoration amongſt the Followers of *Jeſus*?" To which I anſwer, a direct worſhipping of *evil Spirits*, as ſuch, is not charged upon the Church of *Rome*; but ſhould it be ſaid, that the Devil with the reſt of the Apoſtate Spirits are at the ſame Work now they were formerly; and that as before they ſo ſucceſsfully derived the proper Worſhip of the one true GOD upon themſelves, by ſubſtituting the ſeveral Deities of the ancient Pagans, they are ſtill labouring to procure the like Adoration of themſelves by the Advancement of *Romiſh* Saints, I don't know how either you, or the Sons of that Church could diſprove it[f]: Should this be the Caſe, the *Romaniſts* are worſhipping *Demons* in the ſame Senſe the Pagans did, with whom that corrupt Church ſymbolizes but too much in other Articles beſides this[g]; and the *Demons* in the Text will mean, upon your own Ap-

[f] See Mr. *Mede*'s Works, p. 635, 636.

[g] Dr. *Middleton*'s Letter from *Rome*, and the ſeveral Authors referr'd to by *Fabricius* in *Bibliographia Antiq.* p. 107, 108.

plication

plication of the Prophecy, *evil Spirits*, and the Church of *Rome* will ſtand juſtly chargeable with worſhipping *Demons* virtually and effectually, though not formally or directly.

JAMES ii. 19.

Thou believeſt that there is one God, thou doſt well; the Devils alſo believe and tremble.

This Text, you own, "ſeems to be clear for a "Senſe of the Word Δαιμόνια for *evil Spirits*[h];" and you ſuppoſe it was from this Text that the Fathers ſaid thoſe Things concerning Devils which occur ſo frequently in their Writings[i]. This Obſervation, the Merits of which have been before examined[k], one would think might have convinc'd you, that the obvious and natural Senſe was the true one: But you nevertheleſs adventure to ſay[l]: "it may be interpreted, conſiſtently with other "Places of Scripture, of *departed Beings*; and "St. *James*'s reaſoning will be very ſtrict and juſt "taken in that Senſe:" The conſiſtent Meaning of this Text is *evil Spirits*: for the Writers of the New Teſtament, the *Greek* Tranſlators of the Old, with the whole Stream of primitive Antiquity, are remarkably conſentient in this Senſe, and as adverſe to yours; and the Reaſoning, which you think will be very ſtrict and juſt when taken in your Senſe, will run thus: *If thou, who art a Man,* ONLY BELIEVEST *that there is one God, and doſt not bring forth the Fruits of Faith, thou doſt no more than what* DEPARTED MEN *do, who believe and tremble.* I ſay no more.

[h] Further Enquiry, p. 47. [i] *Ibid.*
[k] *Supra*, p. 53. [l] Further Enquiry, p. 48.

I have

I have diſpatch'd your Objections, and muſt think them all capable of receiving ſatisfactory Solutions upon the literal receiv'd Scheme; I deſire you would conſider what has been alledg'd. There is not above one or two that will bear any Diſpute; and as we are always bound to interpret particular Texts by the Tenor of the whole, the Texts you produce can admit of no other Explication than what is agreeable to the other Scriptures. The conſiſtent Scriptural Meaning of the Word *Demon*, has been very fully argued and laid down, and it is ſubmitted to you, whether the objected Texts have not been expounded rationally and in a manner entirely conſonant therewith.

But if the Word *Demon* in the New Teſtament means an *evil Spirit*, and the Heathen Gods are therein called *Demons*, 1 Cor. x. 20. Ps. xcvi. 5. then the whole of the Enquiry muſt fall to the Ground, even tho' that Word ſhould ſignify a *departed Soul* amongſt the ancient *Greeks*. But what muſt the World think, if the Word imported no ſuch thing amongſt them? that the Hypotheſis of the Enquirer, is a whimſical Conceit?

It is inſiſted then, that the Words of St. *John*, *He hath a Devil and is mad*, Joh. x. 20. which Mr. *Mede* and you ſo much rely upon[m], do not import that *to have a Devil* and *to be mad* is the ſame thing, but that Madneſs is there ſpecify'd in order to ſhew of what Nature the *Jews* took the Poſſeſſion to be. Poſſeſſions by evil Spirits diſcover'd themſelves divers Ways, often by the Symptoms of Madneſs, and this they look'd upon to be of that Sort: But it no more follows, that becauſe Madneſs is a natural Diſtemper, therefore

[m] Mr. *Mede*'s Diſcourſe on Joh. x. 20. Enquiry, p. 36, 38.

this

this and many other Demoniacal Caſes were ſuch, than that Leproſy[n] and Blindneſs[o] could not be inflicted by any extraordinary ſupernatural means, becauſe they were common Diſorders.

It is inſiſted again, that tho' *departed Souls* could not inflict Diſeaſes, yet *Demons* might; and therefore your Citations from *Hippocrates* and *Aretæus*[p], and all your Ratiocinations upon the *Cerriti* and *Larvati* of the *Romans*[q], muſt paſs for nothing. The Ancients might run into an Extreme, imputing thro' Ignorance and Fear, more Diſorders to inviſible Agents, than really came from them; but ſtill as their Gods were *Demons*, who as we are aſſur'd from the beſt Authority in the World, both could and did bring Diſeaſes upon Men, I make no Queſtion but they had many true *Demoniacal* Caſes amongſt them.

Theſe Aſſertions are not built upon a precarious Hypotheſis, but are founded in the conſiſtent Doctrine of the Old and New Teſtament; a Doctrine univerſally receiv'd from the Beginning down to the preſent Times, and that without any manner of Oppoſition or Controul, 'till within theſe few Years, and then from ſome ſingle Pens, moſtly of a bad Note[r]. And, indeed, I do not perceive how it can be attack'd to any Purpoſe, unleſs by turning *Sadducee*, and denying the Exiſtence of evil Spirits, or by proving it to be impoſſible that they ſhould bring Diſeaſes upon Mankind, which I am perſuaded you will hardly attempt[s].

[n] 2 KINGS v. 27. [o] ACTS xiii. 11.
[p] Enquiry, p. 7, *ſeq.*
[q] Enquiry, p. 14. *ſeq.* Further Enquiry, p. 69. *ſeq.*
[r] See Mr. *Hutchinſon*'s Sermon, p. 30.
[s] Further Enquiry, p. 48.

But it ſeems, you have a Difficulty in relation to the General Doctrine; for you aſk[t], "How "comes it to paſs that we read of ſo many Per- "ſons, *juſt at the particular Time* of our Saviour's "Miniſtry, under the Power of Devils?" This Difficulty was the Motive that induc'd you to make the Enquiry, and therefore, if you pleaſe, we will briefly conſider, for a Concluſion to this long Epiſtle, how far any Scruple of this Sort, could be ſufficient warrant for you to attempt a Method of Interpretation ſo contrary to the Senſe of all Antiquity, both Sacred and Profane.

The *Moſaic* and *Chriſtian* Diſpenſations muſt always be deemed by *Chriſtians* the Baſis of all true Theology. It is from them we muſt draw all the aſſured well-grounded Knowledge we can have of the immaterial World, purely ſuch; the Objects whereof are of that Sort, as can never otherwiſe than imperfectly be the Subjects of human Reaſon, for want of Ideas and Materials to work upon, and of Capacity to receive them. Theſe high Things are the peculiar Burthen of Revelation; which when it is once made, and we firmly believe it to be the very Word of GOD, it is enough for us, that we are ſure ſuch and ſuch Truths are therein delivered, and that they are not *contrary* to our Reaſon. We receive ſuch Truths as theſe upon the Credit and Authority of the Revealer; we receive them, even tho' they are attended with ſome Difficulties, becauſe it is impoſſible from the Nature of them, that they ſhould be adequately comprehended by ſuch limited Intelligences as we are. Thus it is that we embrace the Doctrine of the Trinity, and of the Incarnation of the Son of GOD, altho' we do not pretend to underſtand thoſe

[t] Enquiry, p. 1.

Myſteries

Myſteries fully at preſent, neither are able, as daily Experience ſhews, to anſwer every puzzling Queſtion, which fond and perverſe Mortals are pleaſed to aſk, to their Satisfaction. Such Truths as theſe, are conſiſtent with Difficulties; and accordingly in Demonology, it may be very difficult to ſay, why God ſhould create that evil Being the *Devil*, who, he could not but foreſee, would prove ſo great an Adverſary, and work ſo much Miſchief to Mankind. This very thing has given Occaſion to many Diſputes; and it is very poſſible, that ſhould you be interrogated concerning this Matter, by ſuch another Enquirer as yourſelf, you might be put to it to aſſign ſuch Reaſons as ſhould convince him, tho' at the ſame Time you firmly and rationally believe yourſelf, both the Exiſtence of that Prince of Darkneſs, and that he is a Creature of God's Hand. Why then ſhould you wonder to find yourſelf ſomewhat puzzled for a Reaſon, why the ſame God permitted ſo much Power to *unclean Spirits, at the Time of our Saviour's Incarnation?* Or why Poſſeſſions were then more *frequent* than uſual? We are taught in Scripture that the Gods of the Heathen were *Demons*, but the ſame Scriptures, not condeſcending to tell us in what Manner the Demons operated and impoſed upon the Heathen in thoſe dark Ages of Superſtition, we find the Fathers differing upon this Point, even in the ſecond Century[v]. The Thing then may be true, there might be more Demoniacs then, than either before or after, notwithſtanding any Difficulties you may be preſſed with in giving Reaſons for it: And I humbly conceive, that tho' a modeſt Enquirer may propoſe a Queſtion of this Sort, and learned Men are at Li-

[v] See before, p. 59.

berty to offer their Solutions, and will think themſelves bound ſo to do, yet ſhould they not always ſucceed in their Endeavours, ſo as to pleaſe the Demander perfectly, the deliver'd Truth would neither ſuffer any Detriment by the Miſcarriage, nor the Demander in believing it nevertheleſs; however he certainly might very well diſpenſe with himſelf from flying in the Face of all Antiquity, and from venting a chimerical Hypotheſis, merely becauſe he was not ſatisfied: But ſhould he determine to do otherwiſe, his Proceeding would then be juſt as unreaſonable, as it would be preſumptuous for him to make himſelf a Judge of the Senſe of any *Greek* Word now, in Oppoſition to all them who liv'd at the Time when the Word was in uſe, and were *Greeks* either by Nation, or Language, or both.

It may be of uſe to remark here, that at this time of day, Difficulties do even attend ſome natural Facts related in Scripture, which yet conſiderate Men will believe nevertheleſs. The Leproſy, for Inſtance, is repreſented there, as a Diſtemper much more frequent than it is now, even in that Clime. For three or four of theſe laſt Centuries I ſuppoſe this Diſtemper and the *Lues Venerea* may have been confounded; that it was ſo in this Kingdom has been learnedly and ſolidly prov'd by an ingenious Writer[x]; the Confuſion of the two Maladies, and their paſſing under one common Name, the Leproſy, would greatly increaſe the Number of Lepers for the Time, no doubt; but in the more early Ages, before the *Lues Venerea* came into the World, this could not be the Caſe. Now it is poſſible for Gentlemen that ſhall pleaſe to ſet their Wits to work, to aſk many Queſtions, and

[x] Mr. *Becket* in the Philoſophical Tranſactions, Part iii. p. 149. *& alibi.*

to

to form various Conjectures concerning the Rifeneſs of the Leproſy amongſt the Ancients, and perhaps the ableſt Advocates of Revelation might be troubled to return ſuch Anſwers as they ſhould think full; but yet I apprehend the Fact would not be the leſs true for that Reaſon. As the *Lues Venerea* has but lately ſtarted up, it is reaſonable to think, there were Diſtempers formerly, which are loſt now; the Diſappearance of any Diſtemper now, would therefore be no concluſive Argument againſt the Reality of its Exiſtence formerly; much leſs would the preſent Rareneſs of any Diſorder be Proof againſt the former Frequency of it. Could *Hippocrates* or *Galen* be by any means inform'd by Witneſſes of Ability and Integrity, how Matters are now with us in relation to the Venereal Diſtemper, and ſhould take it into their Heads to diſcredit it, ſolely becauſe they had never heard of ſuch a thing, or could not account for it; we ſhould certainly think them very perverſe Creatures. But to return.

You do not deny, for your Part, but there are Difficulties on your Side of the Queſtion [y]. Now theſe, as many as there are of them, will bear very hard upon you, becauſe as a Difficulty on the other Side afforded you the Pretence of writing againſt the receiv'd Interpretation, every thing on your Part ought to be perfectly clear and free from Incumbrance. It is not my Deſign to enumerate every particular Difficulty in your Scheme, neither is there any Occaſion for it after what has been ſaid by Mr. *Twells*. I ſhall content myſelf with obſerving upon the Enquiry in general, that an unprejudic'd Perſon, had you advis'd with any ſuch, muſt have ſeen two or three unſurmountable

[y] Enquiry, p. 74. Further Enquiry, p. 108.

Difficulties in it. The Firſt, the eſtabliſhing your new Senſe of the Word *Demon* amongſt the Ancient *Greeks*. The Second, the introducing afterwards any claſſical Senſe of that Word into the New Teſtament. And the Third, the oppoſing the Voice of the whole *Chriſtian* Church for ſo many Ages. Attentive Readers will be apt to think it not leſs ſtrange, that the whole *Chriſtian* Church from the Beginning down to this preſent Time, ſhould be ignorant of the true Meaning of the Word *Demon*, tho' ſo great a Part of it was *Greek*, than that now you are not able to ſatisfy yourſelf why there were ſo many *Demoniacs* during our Saviour's Miniſtration. They will think the Goodneſs of GOD as much engaged, to preſerve his Church, which had the Promiſe of *being led into all Truth*, from falling inſtantly into invincible Error, as to reſtrain at that Time the Power of thoſe unclean Spirits who delight in doing Miſchief.

And thus conſidering duly the Nature of the Thing, namely, that the whole Doctrine of Angels both good and bad, ſo far as we can aſſuredly reſt upon it, is altogether Matter of Revelation; together with the Strength of Evidence, and the certain uniform manner in which the receiv'd Notion of *Demoniacs* hath been delivered down to us; to have behav'd like a rational ſedate Agent in this Affair, you ought to have forborn this wild Attempt, notwithſtanding the Difficulty you found in accounting for the great Number of *Demoniacs* in our Saviour's Time. However, as this Objection appear'd ſo conſiderable to your Imagination, as to make you think it worth while to trouble the World with it, it is fit you ſhould be made eaſy, if poſſible, and therefore

fore I ſhall willingly uſe my Endeavours to remove all Scruple from your Mind.

After that too ſucceſsful Attempt, which that old Serpent the *Devil* made upon our firſt Parents, his Power was continually gaining Ground in the World; the reſtleſs Temper of the Fiend would prompt him to practiſe every Art, and the Progreſs of Idolatry ſhews he did. 'Tis rational to ſuppoſe, that as his Power was at its greateſt Height, at the Time when our Bleſſed Saviour appear'd, he would then exert himſelf the moſt viſibly and forcibly; he was then to receive a Downfal, and would not fail both to reſiſt to the utmoſt, and to work all the Miſchief he poſſibly could. It is evident he did then beſtir himſelf in an extraordinary manner from the Attempts he made upon our Bleſſed Saviour and the Apoſtles. This now may be thought a good Reaſon why there were more Perſons under the Power of Demons at that Time than any other. But ſay you, "We rarely meet with *Demoniacal* Caſes amongſt "Men, either *before* or *after* the Times of *Jeſus* "*Chriſt*[a]:" Not ſo *often* as then, for the Reaſon given; but however there were many ſuch both *before* and *after*. The Power of the Devil was not totally cruſh'd at once, but it ceaſed by Degrees, as we learn from the Acts of the Apoſtles, and the Writings of the primitive Fathers, who frequently appeal to the Power of exorciſing *Demons*, eſpecially the *Apologiſts*[b]: And as to the Ante-Goſpel Times, the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, as Mr. *Mede* obſerves[c], do not repreſent Poſſeſſions as a *ſtrange* or *extraordinary* Thing among the *Jews*, and we have no Reaſon to ima-

[a] Enquiry, p. 1.
[b] *Juſtin. Mart. Theoph. Antioch. Tertull. Min. Felix. Cyprian.*
[c] Mr. *Mede's* Diſcourſe on JOH. x. 20.

gine the *Gentiles* were more exempted from the Oppreſſion of the Devil, than them. MAT. viii. 28. xv. 22.

This is my Reſolution of your Difficulty in few Words; whether it will prove to your Satisfaction or not, I cannot tell; but it is ſuch as I am contented with myſelf, and perhaps may have its Weight with other not more unreaſonable Men.

Your humble Servant.

SAM. PEGGE.

FINIS.